This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

A. Wilford Hall

# UNIVERSALISM

# AGAINST ITSELF:

(REVISED EDITION)

## A SCRIPTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINE,

By A. Wilford Hall, Ph. D.

---

Whole Number Sold, 55,000.
Revised Edition, Second 1,000.

---

"*Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.*" 1 Cor. X. 12.

---

NEW YORK:
23 PARK ROW,
HALL AND COMPANY.
1883.

BX
9947
.H34
1883
Cop. 1

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1883, by A. WILFORD HALL, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Electrotyped and Printed by HANDY & WALTERS, 45 to 51 Rose Street, New York.

## PREFACE.

This book was originally written when the author was quite young,—but little turned of twenty,—but it was some two or three years later before he had found friends who were willing to advance the means for issuing the first 5,000 copies, an edition which many thought would never all be called for. A year, however, had not passed before the edition was entirely exhausted, and from the sale of which the author was enabled to return the money borrowed, leaving a surplus sufficient for another edition. To avoid the necessity of large editions, he was advised to have the work stereotyped which he personally supervised at Cincinnati, Ohio. From this point editions of one thousand copies each began to be issued to meet the rapidly increasing demand, until within about four years thereafter more than 40,000, copies of the work had been sold.

At this time a sudden decline in the author's health prevented his personal application to the sale of the book; so he turned the plates over to a friend, while he sought other employment better suited to his physical recuperation. After the issue of a few more editions, the plates found their way into the hands of the Methodist Book Concern of that city whose then managers employed the Rev. W. P. Strickland, D. D., one of their well-known ministers, to write an Introduction to the work. This Introduction we deem so well written and so directly to the point, that we have concluded to retain it in the work in its present revised form.

The Book-Concern continued issuing the work for several years, selling many thousand copies chiefly among the Methodist ministers and laymen in the Southern and Western States.

It finally went out of print, and for more than twenty-five years has not been published.

Such is the early history of this book;—such its origin, such its rise, and such its progress,—a sale at that period unparalleled in the annals of the publishing trade for a controversal work of the kind. Yet the book was not well written, viewed from a literary standpoint. It was not to have been expected under the circumstances. It grew spontaneously out of the rough soil of controversy harrowed over and over by many public debates in which the author took part with Universalist clergymen far and near, and to which he was called by different churches who had heard reports of his discussions. At that time, as is well-remembered by the elder ministers of the different denominations, the Western States abounded with Universalist ministers valerous for fight, and ready on all occasions to engage in combat with clergymen of the orthodox school, challenging them right and left and smiting them hip and thigh, few being found able to stand during a lengthy debate before the champions of this new and rapidly spreading doctrine. This was chiefly due to the fact that the liberal debaters had their numerous proof-texts well in hand and thoroughly committed to memory, so that they could rain them in torrents upon the heads of their opponents, who, in turn, though many of them excellent debaters and fine schollars, were by no means sufficiently familiar with the scriptures to cope with these skilled and drilled lancers. The result was that nine times in ten the liberal leaders came off victorious, which only added to the increasing furor with which the new doctrine was received by the masses. To meet this state of things required special preparation, which their new antagonist was not long in recognizing, and accordingly the scriptures were made a special study. The arguments employed in those discussions by the author of this work were entirely original with himself, he having up to that time never

read a single book on the subject, and having attended but one public debate before entering the controversial arena. The book, like the debates, therefore, contained some bitter and acrimonious things, and besides this, many crude expressions crept into the work which ought to have been weeded out before publication, and which have, as far as possible, been pruned away in this revision. Still the author has not felt at liberty in revising the book to make it a reconstruction. He has retained the general form of the arguments unchanged, though he has tried at the same time so to tone down the style of the various discussions as to make them unobjectionable as far as possible even to the ministers whose views are opposed, many of whom are now and have been for years among the author's warmest personal friends.

To add to the value and interest of the book as now revised, it has been deemed advisable to append at the conclusion of the work the author's treatise on the *Immortality of The Soul*, as it appeared in the first volume of his *Microcosm*, and also his three leading Editorials in the Second Volume of the same Magazine, entitled—*Does Death End All?* These papers, it is thought, may prove an appropriate termination to the discussions of the book after the critical analysis of more than 800 separate passages of scripture taken from the Old and New Testaments.

That the work may be received kindly, and that it may tend in some measure to bring the church and the clergy—especially those who are inclining toward radical theological views—back to the ancient scripture landmarks, is the unfeigned wish of THE AUTHOR.

# INTRODUCTION

BY REV. W. P. STRICKLAND, D. D.

The system of belief denominated Universalism, which teaches that all men will be saved irrespective of moral character, is as old as sin itself; and grows as necessarily out of the depravity of the heart, as rank weeds are produced by a luxuriant and uncultivated soil.

Perhaps no form of error has ever been devised so perfectly adapted to deceive the lovers of sin, as the one under consideration. It at once addresses itself to the depraved appetites and passions of men; and is so admirably adjusted to this end, that it inspires a fallacious hope, in which there is no reason, and for the support of which there is no evidence.

Whenever the heart pleads the cause, the understanding is a very lenient and partial judge. That which men wish to be true, they require but little evidence to convince them of its truth; and, on the other hand, what they do not wish to be true, scarcely any amount of evidence is sufficient to convince them of its falsehood.

The following work is a thorough but fair analysis and exposure of a system, false in all its leading features, and more dangerous in its tendencies than all other errors put together. It brings the doctrine of Universalism at once to the test of scripture truth, and carrying the war into Africa, shows up, in the sunlight of demonstration, its gross absurdities and palpable inconsistencies. The book deals in facts, any one of which is worth a volume of assertions and arguments, however plausible.

The reader will find that throughout the entire work, the Bible is made its own interpreter, and the very passages on which the advocates of universal salvation rely for the support of their doctrine, are, by a true interpretation, turned directly against the system. It follows up and analyzes every exegesis, every argument, and every proposition; tearing off the veil of sophistry, and exposing the system in its true light; leaving not a single hook on which to hang a hope of salvation only through the gospel method of repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Every orthodox minister is here furnished with a text-book on Universalism, superior to any work of the kind heretofore published; and every private Christian, by reading it, may at once discover the fallacy of that reasoning which ignores every attribute of God, except His mercy, and even destroys the character of that attribute, by requiring its exercise at *the expense* of, and contrary to, all the other attributes of *Deity.*

# UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF.

## CHAPTER I.

### PROOF-TEXTS OF UNIVERSALISM EXAMINED.

"*Prove all things and hold fast that which is good.*"—1 Thess. v : 21.

1. Gen. 22 : 18. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

1. This is one of the most important proof-texts of the Scriptures supposed to favor Universalism, and is perhaps oftener quoted by the advocates of that doctrine than any other. But in quoting it and relying upon it as applicable to the future life, and as favoring the final holiness and happiness of the entire human race, Universalists are forced into various admissions, expressed and implied, that are fatal to their favorite doctrine. The assumption, for example, that promises of a universal or general character are *absolute* or *unconditional* is one of the very foundation pillars of the temple of Universalism, and if this single assumption can be proved to be fallacious and clearly contrary to Scripture, a large portion of the testimony heretofore relied upon is proved not only to be of no avail, but is absolutely opposed to the doctrine. We will therefore give special attention to this text as covering that branch of Scripture evidence relating to God's promises concerning man, and in such exegesis we will endeavor to show that this class of texts furnishes no evidence whatever in favor of the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind.

2. The force of the argument depends entirely upon the meaning and application of the word *shall* :—"In thy seed *shall* all the nations of the earth be blessed." Universalists are forced to assume that the promise is unconditional, or in no wise dependent on conditions to be performed by man, or otherwise the text is of no use to the doctrine. They assume this because no condition is expressed. But we will now undertake to prove that many of the promises and threatenings of the Bible are conditional, and depend upon the actions of men for their accomplishment, even when the condition *is not expressed*, but merely implied. But previous to this, we lay down an important rule of interpretation, without which no man can shield the Bible from numerous contradictions, and from an ignorance of which, have originated nearly all the false doctrines in Christendom ; and many (especially among the Universalists) from not understanding this *rule*, have turned avowed infidels, and denied in toto the Divine authenticity of the Bible. The rule is this : *that a condition being expressed in any part of the Bible with* respect to any promise or

*threat, that condition must be understood as implied, in all other places where that promise or threat is recorded, if not there expressed!* With this *rule* before us we will now examine some of the threats and promises of the Bible.

3. "And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried and said: yet forty days, and Ninevah *shall* be overthrown." (Jonah 3. 4.) *Here* there is no condition expressed. It is not said: "Yet forty days and Ninevah shall be overthrown," *if* the people do not repent. But did not the Ninevites so understand it? Read the next verse: "So the people of Ninevah *believed God*, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them." Now if the people of Ninevah *believed God*, as it is here declared, why did they repent in sackcloth, unless they understood that there was a condition implied in this threat, and that they might by repentance avert the threatened judgment? Why did they not coolly submit to their fate,—await the forty days, and be destroyed, without exerting themselves in the manner they did? The response of all must be: it was because they understood that there was a condition *implied* in that threat. But was their understanding of the matter correct? Read on. "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil *he said he would do* unto them, *and he did it not.*" (verse 10.) Now Universalists have to take one of three grounds: Either 1. That God told the Ninevites a falsehood: or 2. That the Ninevites were actually destroyed in forty days, and thus flatly contradict the record: or 3. That there was a condition implied in that threat. The former two they will not assert: hence the latter they are compelled to admit, which lays the axe at the very root of their chief assumption.

4. "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith: I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father should walk before me forever [no condition expressed here]; but now the Lord saith: be it far from me [to perform this promise], for them that honor me, I will honor; and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." (1 Sam. 2. 30.) Thus, notwithstanding God had promised, without expressing any condition, that the house of Ely, and the house of his father should walk before him forever; but because they refused to honor him, by the contempt with which they had treated his ordinances, and thus did not perform the condition *implied* in this promise;—therefore the Lord reversed the matter, and instead of continuing to confer upon them the honorary distinctions of sacerdotal dignity, brought upon them shame and confusion of face.

5. "Then said David: O Lord God of Israel, thy servant hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to Keilah to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hand? will Saul come down, as thy servant hath heard? O Lord God of Israel I beseech thee, tell thy servant. And the Lord said: *he will come down.* [*No* condition expressed.] Then said David: will the

men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And the Lord said: *they will deliver thee up.* [No *if* in the case expressed.] Then David and his men, which were about six hundred, arose and departed out of Keilah,—and it was told Saul that David was escaped from Keilah, and *he forbare to go forth.*" (1 Sam. 23. 10–13.) Here again we have Universalists in a dilemma. According to their doctrine, either Saul *did* come down, and the men of Keilah *did* deliver David and his men into the hand of Saul, because there was no condition expressed, or the Bible is false, and David was killed by Saul in Keilah, notwithstanding he reigned King over Israel many years after Saul was dead! When God said, in reply to the requests of David; Saul *will come down;* and the men of Keilah will *deliver thee up;* it was implied: *if* you continue in the city. This the sequel proves; for David left the city, and consequently Saul did not come down, neither was David delivered into his hands. Universalists are compelled to acknowledge our position, or deny the truth of the Bible.

6. We have another most striking evidence of the conditionality of divine promises when the condition is only implied; and that too in the case of Abraham. We can thus let one promise to Abraham explain another. To this none should object. "And he said unto Abraham: know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years,—but in the fourth generation they *shall* come hither again. (Gen. 15. 13–16.) This promise is without an expressed condition; and has just as much appearance of *absoluteness* as the one under examination upon which Universalism is based. I can fancy I hear the Jews, as they were traveling through the wilderness,—those disobedient fellows who were tinctured with Universalism,—debating with Moses and Aaron, and reasoning something on this wise: "Surely we shall all be brought safely into the land of Canaan without the loss of one. This is as sure, and as firm, as the pillars of heaven. For God swear to our father Abraham, that after his seed had sojourned in the land of Egypt 400 years, they should be brought again into this land; and there was no *if* in the case;—hence it is unconditional. Mark the positive, absolute manner in which it is expressed. 'In the fourth generation they *shall come hither again:*' and who dares to call in question the oath of Jehovah? Therefore ye men of Israel, although it would be better to walk in the commandments of God, yet you need have no fears with reference to that goodly land: the oath of Jehovah cannot be broken; and though you lie, steal, commit fornication, and bow down to other gods, and worship graven images made with your own hands: still you are perfectly safe, so far as the land of Canaan is concerned; for *that* depends alone upon the unconditional promise to Abraham. God, you recollect, confirmed the same thing to us when we were eating the passover: 'It shall come to pass, when ye

be come to the land which the Lord *will give you, according as he has promised.*' (Ex. 12. 25.) What need we of further witness? God says he *will* give us the land of Canaan, according as he has *promised.* No condition here either: hence it will be certainly ours; notwithstanding these orthodox leaders, Moses and Aaron, are continually limiting the Holy One of Israel, and teaching the absurd dogma, that our finite offences may frustrate the purposes of an *infinite* God, and that on account of our sins, we shall die in the wilderness, and fail to reach the promised land," &c., &c.

7. This kind of reasoning in the abstract, has some appearance of plausibility we confess; yet the Lord has replied to all such logic, and the difficulty, we think, is satisfactorily disposed of. Let us now hear what he says: "As truly as I live saith the Lord;—your carcasses shall fall in the wilderness, and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upwards, which have murmured against me, doubtless *ye shall not come into the land* concerning which I *swear to make you dwell therein*, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun. After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year shall you bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my *breach of promise*,—in this wilderness they shall be consumed, and *there they shall die.*" (Num. 14. 28–35.) This settles the controversy with Universalism, as based upon the assumption of absolute promises.—Though God had made a promise to bring the posterity of Abraham into the land of Canaan, and had confirmed it with an oath, giving it all the appearance of *absoluteness* which can be attached to the proof-text under examination; yet, notwithstanding all this, the Jews by their unbelief and consequent disobedience, caused God to break that promise (or take advantage of the implied condition) and their carcasses fell in the wilderness; so Paul says: "They could not enter in, because of unbelief." (Heb. 3. 19.) It was not because God was unwilling to bring them in, but it was their own disobedience which caused the "*breach of promise.*" Had we no other proofs to offer upon this subject, the way the matter now stands, we would have the strongest probabilities in favor of our position, and against Universalism. This, however, is but a fraction of the evidence we have to offer.

8. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then *I will repent of the good* wherewith *I said I would benefit them.*" (Jer. 18. 9, 10.) Now, suppose we admit the text under examination, to be a promise of universal salvation as claimed, what would it avail Universalism, since God has most distinctly declared: "If they do evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, *then will I repent of the good* [*universal salvation*] *wherewith I said I would benefit them.* Just as certain as God *has promised* salvation in heaven to men, just so certain they may

forfeit this *good*, wherewith God has said he would benefit them. The only way to meet this difficulty is to deny that God has ever promised salvation in heaven to any body (for we have seen that as certain as heaven is promised, so certain it may be forfeited by disobedience), and take the ground, that all will be saved by *chance!*

9 Once more: "When I say to the righteous that he *shall surely live* [this is expressed in language even stronger than the promise to Abraham], *if* he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered, but for his iniquity that he hath committed, *he shall die for it.* Again, when I say to the wicked, *thou shalt surely die* [Universalists would say, this *surely* is unconditional], *if* he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right,—he *shall surely live*, he *shall not die.*" (Ezek. 33. 13–15.) There are two things in connection with this subject unaccountably strange. The first is: that the prophets should be so exceedingly particular in teaching principles the very opposite of Universalism. The second is: that the system of Universalism should ever have found a lodgement in the cranium of any man of intelligence and be defended as if sanctioned by Scripture testimony. The testimony of the prophet, as above quoted, is most pointed and emphatic against this doctrine. Suppose Universalists should find a text, which declared in so many words: the whole human family *shall surely be saved;*" still it would not prove Universalism, unless it could be demonstrated that the *whole human family*, without exception, would do that which is *lawful and right:* for we can turn over to Ezekiel, where the Lord has once for all, and forever put an end to controversy upon this subject, and where he has given us a clear, and most explicit explanation of all such promises. He there informs us, that though he should declare in language the most emphatic, that the *whole human family shall surely be saved;* yet if they should commit iniquity, and refuse to do that which is lawful and right, they *shall surely be damned*, they *shall not be saved!!* From this we learn, that there *cannot* be such thing as an *absolute* or *unconditional* promise, involving the happiness of man. God here informs us, that though He should make the most *positive* promise, without expressing or even intimating a condition, still there would be a condition *implied;* and it would depend upon the lawful and righteous conduct of men for its fulfillment! Sufficient has thus been said, we think, to dispose of Universalism as based upon the assumption of absolute promises in general: yet it may be necessary to be a little more particular, and adduce a few more testimonies, with respect to the promise at the head of this article.

10. Some deference at least should be paid to the views entertained by the *apostles* concerning this promise. We shall first hear the opinion of Peter, as he was honored with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In a very notable discourse, delivered by him in Solomon's porch, before a large audience of the Jews, he declares: "Ye

are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. [Unconditionally? No.] Unto you first, God having raised up his son Jesus, *sent him to bless you*, [How?] *in turning away* every one of you *from his iniquities.*" [Acts 3. 25, 26.] Now, I have no objection to all men being saved, provided they all submit to be turned away from their iniquities. Peter here declares most positively that they cannot be blessed, according to the promise made to Abraham, unless Christ does turn them away from their iniquities. And this he is to do *here*, by his *first* mission. Mark the language. "God having raised up his son Jesus, *sent him to bless you:*" not *will send* him to bless you at the resurrection! But did Peter tell them in that discourse, what plan Christ had appointed, in order to turn them away from their iniquities? He certainly did. "*Repent* ye therefore and *be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,*" [verse 19,] or, which is precisely the same, that you may be *turned away from your iniquities.* From this testimony it is incontrovertably established that the *blessing* promised in the seed of Abraham, is forgiveness of sins, to be enjoyed by "*all nations*" in this life, and is suspended upon the conditions of *repentance and conversion!*

11. We shall next hear Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles. Universalists will certainly not object to his testimony. "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself,—that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, *we might have strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us.*" [Heb. 6. 13, 18.] From this we discover, that the *consolation*, or the *blessing* included in the promise to Abraham, was for those only who *fled for refuge*, and who *laid hold* on the *hope* set before them in the gospel. Thus Paul's explanation of this promise, so far from favoring the theory of Universalism, leaves it stranded. But hear him again: "The Scriptures forseeing that God would *justify* the heathen *through faith*, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying: in thee shall all nations be *blessed.*" [Gal. 3. 8.] According to this, the *blessing* referred to in the promise to Abraham, was nothing more nor less than *justification by faith.* If this be true, then two things must follow: 1. That the promise to Abraham is conditional. 2. That all who are not *of faith* have no share in the blessing promised. In order now to determine whether we have correctly understood the apostle's view of this subject, we ask him this definite question: Who are to participate in the *blessing* promised to Abraham? He answers: "They which be *of faith*, are *blessed* with faithful Abraham." [verse 9.] In verse 29th he adds; "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and *heirs* according to the *promise.*" Who are Christ's? Ans. "They that are Christ's *have crucified the flesh* with the affections and lusts." [Gal. 5. 24.]

Heirship *according to the promise* we discover from this to be conditional. None are heirs, except those who are children; for Paul says: "If *children*, then *heirs*." [Rom. 8. 17.] Let us now inquire if becoming *children of God*, and *children of Abraham*, is conditional; for, mark it, upon this is suspended *heirship*, "according to the *promise*." If we become children of God, and children of Abraham *conditionally;* then we become *heirs* according to the *promise, conditionally:* and consequently the *blessing* included in the *promise* to Abraham is not *absolute* or *unconditional*, as Universalists so confidently assert. Let us see. "We are all the *children, of God, by faith* in Christ Jesus." [Gal. 3. 26.] "Know ye therefore, that they which are *of faith*, the same are the *children of Abraham*." [Gal. 3. 7.] The whole matter now stands thus; Paul's view of the subject being correct. 1. We cannot be heirs, according to the promise made to Abraham, unless we belong to Christ the seed of Abraham; and we cannot be Christ's unless we crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts. 2. We cannot be heirs of the *blessing promised* to Abraham, the *unsearchable riches* of Christ, unless we are *children;* and none can be children, only those who "*are of faith;*" and hence the argument in favor of the *conditionality* of the *promise* to Abraham, is put beyond the reach of controversy. Peter's explanation, as we have seen, left Universalism dead; but Paul's leaves the doctrine *twice* dead, and plucked up by the roots!

12. In conclusion upon this promise, we present *Universalism against itself.* Its advocates contend that *all nations*, must mean the *whole human family*, without exception. All we have to do now, to make Universalism stultify itself, is to read another text with its own definition. "When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered *all nations* [that is: the entire posterity of Adam] and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." [Math. 25. 31, 32.] Query: Was the whole human family arraigned before Titus at the destruction of Jerusalem? Were Universalits present on that occasion? If not, then the coming of the Lord is yet future, themselves being judges. We therefore speak within bounds, when we say that *Universalism* is virtually renounced by its advocates, whenever this text is summoned to its support.

2. Psalm 22. 27. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.

Psalm 86, 9. All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name.

Universalism teaches that this *turning to the* Lord, worshiping *before him, and glorifying* his name, is all to take place in the tem-

rection state; and when this is done, all will be brought to know God, and be saved from sin. But here again we have *Universalism against itself:* for men cannot be made holy and happy in the operation or process of being *raised* from the dead, as Universalism teaches; and at the same time be made holy and happy by *remembering*, and *turning* to the Lord, and *glorifying* his name, *after* they are raised! They cannot *remember* and *turn to the Lord* and *worship* him, in the *resurrection*, for *this*, they will have no hand in; hence the worshiping and turning to the Lord must take place afterward; and consequently they must be *raised in their sins.* But let us look at these proof-texts. The word *shall*, upon which the whole argument is here based, has not the same meaning, as in the promise to Abraham just examined. It is here used in the sense of a command, as it always is when it precedes duties to be performed by man. The *remembering*, *worshiping*, *turning to the Lord*, and *glorifying* his name, are all duties to be performed by the "*all nations*," "*kindreds*," and "*ends of the world*," named in the above texts. It does not follow however, because God says all the ends of the world *shall turn*, that therefore they actually *will turn.* When Moses had predicted the coming of a prophet, whom the Lord should raise up like unto him, he concludes by saying: "Him *shall* ye hear." Did all the Jews hear this prophet? No. What proof then is there, that *shall*, in the above proof-texts, is any more likely to be accomplished? Universalists quote Dan. 7. 14, and apply it to this present world. We admit it; and it reads thus: "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that *all people, nations*, and *languages* should serve him." This is as extensive as the texts under examination; and now why, let me ask, do not all people, nations, and languages serve him? Let Universalists explain this, and the explanation will apply unanswerably to the texts at the head of this article. They dare not apply this language of Daniel to eternity, for fear of verse 10. And hence they are bound to explain it, so as to harmonize with facts as they exist in this world; which is all we ask; and then it will be understood, that by the word *shall*, God commands "all the kindreds of the nations," and "all the ends of the world," to come and worship before him, just as he "commands all men every where to repent," and leaves it optional with them whether to obey or not.

3. Psalm 145, 9. The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.

1. This text proves nothing in favor of Universalism, but is in reality opposed to that doctrine: and we shall show that *Universalism is against itself*, in trying to warp it into its service. We will now state three facts, and draw one conclusion which will prove *the above allegation.* 1. God *is* good to all in the present tense:—

not *will be* good in the resurrection, or at some other future period. 2. Some men are sinful and miserable *now*, notwithstanding God *is* good to all. 3. God is immutable,—the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Therefore God will never be so good, but what he can allow sin and misery to exist.—This conclusion cannot be evaded; for God is *now* just as good as he ever will be to all eternity; and yet, notwithstanding his present infinite goodness, which can never be increased an iota, hundreds and thousands live and die in their sins, guilty, miserable and condemned. Now if God's infinite goodness cannot or will not save them here, then his immutability forbids their salvation hereafter. Universalists do not anticipate the difficulty in which they inevitably involve their doctrine, by quoting such texts. It would be much better for their system, if they could find a text which declared, that God was not *now* very good, but would get better at the resurrection. This might give them some ground to hope that those, who die in their sins, would be redeemed at the resurrection, by the increased goodness of God. But as it is, it leaves them no ground for such an expectation, and is consequently opposed to their doctrine. 4. Again: "His tender mercies are over all his works." From this it is inferred that all will be saved; but it does no more to favor the salvation of all men in the future state, than it does for their salvation now. If the tender mercy of God can be over a man threescore and ten years, and he be sinful and miserable all the while; what proof is there that he may not be sinful and miserable in the future state, notwithstanding the tender mercy of God? But says one: "His mercy endureth forever." Well, what if it does? This mercy can permit men to practice iniquity, till they become a curse to themselves, a disgrace to society, and finally curse God and die, and what better will it make the matter for such mercy to endure forever? The mercy that will allow a man to live in sin all his life, and die in this condition, will not help him out of the difficulty by enduring eternally.

3. But will it do to give this text a universal application? It will not. God is not good to *all*, in the most universal sense of that word *all*; neither are his tender mercies over *all* his works in this sense. Proof in abundance can be given. Was God good to the Sodomites, when he rained down fire and brimstone upon their heads till he had consumed them? Yes, says one; for God says himself: "I took them away as I saw *good*." [Ez. 16. 50.] But good to whom? Not to the Sodomites surely, but it was good to righteous Lot and his family; and in the second place, as Jude says: They were "set forth for an *example*, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." [Jude 7.] Thus, it was a good example for "those who should afterwards live ungodly." [2. Pet. 2. 6.] Paul settles this matter, and we think puts it forever at rest. "Behold therefore the *goodness* and *severity* of God; on them which fell severity, but

following: All righteous men desire the salvation of the whole human family; God has promised, that the desire of the righteous shall be granted; therefore the whole human family will be saved. We will now off-set this argument, by building another according to the same logic:—

It is the desire of the righteous, that all men should be saved from sin in this life, and become sober, honest, and respectable citizens; God has promised that the desire of the righteous shall be granted; therefore all men are now saved from sin, and are sober, honest, and respectable citizens! As far as argument is concerned we are now even; whilst facts, and the Bible contradict us both. We remark that this phrase involves a sort of general principle, and refers probably to the desire of the righteous concerning their own personal salvation; and not to any thing and every thing they may desire; for this being the case, we would be involved immediately in an inextricable labyrinth of contradictions. The Saviour declares, that "many prophets and *righteous men, have desired* to see those things which ye see, and *have not seen them.*" [Math. 13. 17.] Ask a Universalist, if he *desires* to make all the orthodox believe Universalism; and he will answer yes. Now one of two conclusions is unavoidable; either he is an unrighteous man; or has an unrighteous theory!

2. But *Universalism is against itself*, in bringing this text to its support. The first part of this text Universalists never quote: it reads thus: "The *fear* of the wicked it *shall come upon him;*" then comes in the other: "but the desire of the righteous shall be granted." Now as Universalists give the last part of this text a universal application, the first part must necessarily have the same latitude; and consequently every thing that the wicked *fear* shall come upon them. And as hundreds of thousands of the wicked fear endless damnation, therefore it shall be their portion; for God says: "The *fear* of the wicked *it shall come upon him,*" just as emphatically, as that the desire of the righteous shall be granted!

## 5. Prov. 11. 31. Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner.

This text is relied upon as proof that all men are rewarded and punished in this life, to the full extent of their just deserts. But we have any amount of testimony on hand, to prove that this is not a correct conclusion.

1. The language of this text refutes such an idea, if taken literally.—How can the sinner be recompensed "*much more*" than the righteous, if both are recompensed to the *full amount?*

2. This language was spoken under, and with reference to, the Jewish dispensation. Under that dispensation men, as a general thing, received a temporal recompense for their good, as well as their evil deeds, according to the Law.

3. If Universalists are resolved that this shall refer to the Christian dispensation; we will agree, for the sake of the argument: and then comes up the question: what part of the Christian dispensation does it refer to? The Saviour shall answer. "And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed, at the *resurrection of the just.*" [Luke 14. 14.] But it may be asked according to this, will they be recompensed on the earth? Most certainly. Where can the resurrection take place, but upon this earth where the dead are buried? Thus, at the resurrection, the Lord himself declares, they shall be recompensed, for there and then a crown of righteousness shall be placed upon the heads of all the faithful; and there and then the wicked will receive their sentence, and the seal of their everlasting banishment from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.—This much must suffice for the present until we come to treat upon the subject of conscience, when this question will be again resumed. Enough has been said to redeem this text from the service of Universalism, and to prove that the doctrine is even *against itself* in using Prov. 11. 31.

6. Is. 25. 8. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.

This text, although quoted with confidence by the advocates of Universalism, will nevertheless disprove the doctrine. It is true, "the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces;" but *all whose faces?* The remainder of this verse will decide. "And the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of *his people* shall he take away from off all the earth." Thus the phrase, *all faces*, has reference to the people of God. Universalists assume that *all faces* necessarily embrace the whole human family. Let us see. The prophet says: "*All faces* are turned into paleness." [Jer. 30. 6.] Were the faces of the entire human race turned into paleness, in the days of Jeremiah, when millions of them were not then in existence? Were the faces of Enoch and Elijah, who were then in heaven, turned into paleness? Again: "Before their faces the people shall be much pained, *all faces* shall gather blackness." [Joel 2. 6.] If *all faces*, in this verse, signify the whole human family, then it must refer to the resurrection state. This is too obvious to need proof. Now if Is. 25. 8. proves universal salvation because tears shall be wiped from off *all faces*, then Joel 2. 6. proves universal damnation because "the people shall be *much pained;* and *all faces* shall gather *blackness.*" But Universalism is clearly against itself in quoting this proof-text and applying it to the resurrection state. Read the next verse: "And it shall be said in that day [i. e. the day of the resurrection] Lo, this is our God, we have *waited* for him, and he will *save us*, this is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his *salvation.*" Thus Universalists have

to admit, in quoting this text, that none have the promise of salvation at the resurrection only those that have *waited* for the Lord. This also agrees with the apostle: "To them that *look for him* [or wait for him,] shall he appear the second time without sin unto *salvation*." [Heb. 7. 28.]

The next verse tells what will become of those who have not *waited* for the Lord, and consequently who are not *his people*. "And Moab [i. e. the wicked] *shall be trodden down* under him, even as straw is trodden down for the dunghill; and he shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them, as he that swimmeth, spreadeth forth his hands to swim; and he *shall bring down their pride* together with the spoils of their hands." (verses 10, 11.) This is all to take place at the resurrection of the dead according to the Universalist application of this text.

7. Is. 45. 22–24. Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and besides me there is none else. I have sworn by myself: the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return; that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear; surely shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.

1. This is a very important text with the Universalists; but a more suicidal effort cannot be made than in bringing this text to their support. This we will now prove to the satisfaction of every intelligent reader. And in the first place Universalists have to deny the common translation, by expunging the word *one*, before the text will come any where near Universalism. The translation of the Polyglott margin is also against Universalism. It reads thus: "He shall say of me, in the Lord is all righteousness and strength." This does not say who shall have this righteousness and strength, but simply states that it is in the Lord. Hence they have to deny two translations, and make a new one of their own before they can make Is. 45, harmonize with their theory. But still it is against it. The context disproves the doctrine. "*Look* unto me and *be ye saved*, all the ends of the earth." Is not this conditional? Universalism teaches that all the ends of the earth shall be saved, whether they *look* unto the Lord or not.

2. Universalists admit that this prediction applies to the resurrection state: this they have to do, as a matter of course, or it does nothing for their theory, making the most of it.

Let us now read the language immediately following that above quoted, which of course applies to the same state. "Even to him shall men come [i. e. in the resurrection state,] and all that are *incensed* against him shall be *ashamed*." Thus some men are to be *incensed:* that is, *enraged*, or *at enmity* against God in the resurrection state! Will such be holy and happy? As some men are to be

*ashamed* in the resurrection state, will such be saved? No; for Paul says: "Whosoever believeth on him, shall not be *ashamed*." (Rom. 9. 33.) Hence they will be condemned. In this manner we have *Universalism against itself.*

3. But worse still for this contradictory system. By referring Isaiah 45. 23, to the resurrection state, it admits that there and then is to be the *judgment seat of Christ.* The apostle says: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ." How do you know, Paul? Because, "it is written." Where? In Is. 45. 23. "As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God." (Rom. 14: 10, 11.) Thus the whole theory of Universalism is exploded by applying this proof-text as it does, to the resurrection state; for Paul quotes the very same passage, and proves by it that we shall stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ, at the very time when this *bowing* and *confessing* shall take place.—Another clear case of Universalism against itself.

4. But the last verse of this chapter is supposed also to teach Universalism. "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." This however can only prove the salvation of all the Jewish nation, if it proves any thing. But even this cannot be. In order to make this text teach any thing in favor of Universalism two things must be proved. 1. That *shall* is used in an absolute or unconditional sense; or in other words, that there is not a condition implied, as in the promise to Abraham; and 2. That "All the seed of Israel" means the entire Jewish nation, as contradistinguished from the Gentiles. If Universalists undertake either, they will fail; whilst the negative of both can be sustained. 1. The Jews were justified in the days of the apostles invariably upon the conditions of believing and submitting to the gospel, and we have no account of any Jew or Gentile being justified only upon these terms: hence there is a condition *implied* in Isaiah's *shall*, and must be understood the same as if he had said: "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory provided they submit to the Gospel," according to the correct rule of interpretation laid down at the start. This is its true signification. 2. "All the seed of Israel" does not mean the entire Jewish nation. Proof: "Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight; there was none left but the tribe of Judah only,—and the Lord rejected *all the seed of Israel*, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers." [2 Kings, 27: 18, 20.] Did the Lord afflict, and deliver into the hand of spoilers, the entire posterity of Abraham, when thousands of them had died and gone to their graves centuries before, and millions of them were yet unborn? Thus *all the seed of Israel* does not necessarily mean any more than all, or a majority of the Jews living at any one time.

8. Is 46. 10. My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.

Is. 53. 10. The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.

Upon these two texts of scripture we remark: 1. That God has a *counsel* and *pleasure* of his own, which belongs exclusively to himself to perform, independent of the agency of man. This counsel *will stand*, and this pleasure *will be performed*. With respect to this, it is declared: "He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him what doest thou?" [Dan. 4. 35.] But 2, God has a counsel and pleasure to perform, connected with the moral agency of man; a part of which man himself is to perform, or it remains undone. This I will now prove. The Psalmist testifies: "Thou art not a God that hast *pleasure* in wickedness." [Ps. 5. 4.] As God is unchangeable, his pleasure has always been that wickedness should not exist; yet wickedness has existed for nearly six thousand years. Now, God has not performed all his pleasure with reference to the destruction of wickedness, for this reason; it requires the co-operation of man to bring about this result. If God absolutely performed all his *pleasure*, in matters with which man's agency was connected, then it would be an impossibility for man to commit sin, or to *displease* God in any way. This conclusion is too obvious to be called in question: The converse also, must be equally self-evident, that is, if man *can*, and actually does displease God, then the pleasure of the Lord is not always done. Let us see: "But with many of them God was not well *pleased*." [1. Cor. 10. 5.] Then it follows, that he was displeased, which proves that his pleasure is not always done. Again: "Before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God." [Heb. 11. 5.] In this case the pleasure of the Lord was performed; but it was owing to the obedience of Enoch. Again, says the apostle: "If any man draw back, my soul shall have *no pleasure* in him." [Heb. 10. 38.] In such a case the pleasure of the Lord would not be done, which is another confirmation of the truth of the above positions. 3. The fact that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in the hands of Christ, is no proof that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in the hands of the wicked, or that the wicked will all be saved. These are two very different propositions. The pleasure of the Lord that Christ had to perform did prosper in his hands. Hence we hear him say: "Not my will but thine be done." (Luke 22. 42.) This proof-text cannot embrace every thing in the Universe which is according to the pleasure of the Lord: if so, then Christ would long since have done away with sin, and every species of evil, for we have it positively declared that the Lord has no *pleasure* in them; and hence it must be according to his pleasure for them *to cease*.

9. Is. 53. 11. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.

This text comes far short of proving Universalism. It is assumed that all that Christ desired he should see accomplished, and thus be satisfied. But this is not the case. He desired the salvation of Jerusalem as a city, when he said: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem—how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." (Math. 23. 37.) Christ was not satisfied in this case; for he complains and says: "Ye will not come unto me that you might have life." (John 5. 40.) But did he really desire them to come? Certainly. Hear him entreat: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" [Math. 11. 28.] but they did not come, and consequently the Saviour was not satisfied in the Universalist application of this text. Again: Christ desires the salvation of all men in this life, as much as he does in the next; but is he satisfied? By no means. This difficulty stares Universalism in the face, but it cannot dispose of it. Christ however is satisfied with what he has done in bringing about, and completing a plan of salvation; and in the out-come, if but a few are saved, the Saviour will be satisfied: because no blame can be reflected upon him, and because those who are not saved might have been had they been disposed; and therefore their damnation is just. Thus: "He shall see of the travail of his soul [i. e. those who have believed and obeyed the gospel,] and shall be satisfied."

10. Is. 55. 11. *So* shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

Universalists assume that this scripture proves their doctrine from the fact that God has sent forth his word to effect the salvation of all men; and he declares that it shall accomplish the thing for which he sent it. But we shall soon discover that this argument, like most others, has its foundation laid deep in sophistry and misapprehension. Look at the first word in the text: "*So* shall my word be." How? Read the preceding verse, and it will tell. "For *as* the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it to bring forth and bud, *that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater*;" (Then comes in the text:) "*so* shall my word be." How? "*As* the rain." This solves the whole difficulty. The rain comes down and prepares the soil, that man may have seed to sow and bread to eat; provided he attend to the ordinances of Nature,—the ordinances of plowing, sowing, reaping, gathering into his barn, and preparing for use. But the rain brings bread to no man independently of his own exertion

and co-operation. "*So* shall my word be," says God: "it shall accomplish that which I please;" upon the same principle of the rain which comes down from heaven; it shall bring the blessings of the gospel within the reach of man, and if he, by attending to the means of grace, "*lay hold*" of the rich boon of "*eternal life*," he will be blessed; but if he, like the sluggard, will not plow by reason of the cold, he shall beg in the immortal harvest and have nothing. Thus *Universalism is against itself* in bringing into its service this declaration of the prophet, and for this reason: it is thus admitted that the word of God is sent forth to secure the future and immortal salvation of man;—this shows in the first place, that man's future salvation was, and is in danger, which Universalism denies; and as the word of God accomplished its object upon the same principle that the rain gives seed to the sower and bread to the eater, which is by our attending to *means;* then it follows, that none can enjoy the future salvation only such as comply with the conditions which the word of God has enjoined.

**11.** Lam. 3. 31. For the Lord will not cast off forever. Is. 57. 16. For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made.

1. These two declarations of scripture have been reiterated by Universalists, until they are worn thread-bare, without once appealing to the context to know *who* "the Lord will not cast off forever." In the chapter from which the first text is quoted, Jeremiah is lamenting his own afflictions, and those of his brethren, and says: "the Lord will not cast off forever," that is, such as return from their evil way, and reform at the chastisements of the Lord. This is confirmed by verse 25: "The Lord is *good* unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him." But he changes the subject at the close of that chapter, and speaks of the destiny of those who are the enemies of God, and of his people: who were not subjects of this merciful chastisement. "Render unto them a recompense, O Lord, according to the works of their hands; give them sorrow of heart; thy *curse* upon them; *persecute* and *destroy* them in *anger* from under the heavens of the Lord." [Lam. 3. 64–66.] This does not look much like Universalism: To *recompense* them in *anger*, and with *sorrow* of heart;—to *curse* them, and *persecute* them, and *destroy* them from under the heavens of the Lord! If this be Universalism, it is such indeed with a vengeance!

2. The context of the other quotation is also against Universalism. When the prophet Isaiah testifies that the Lord "will not contend *forever*," he refers (as does Jeremiah,) to those who are chastised, and who are thereby led to reformation, and not at all to the wicked who "wax worse and worse deceiving and being deceived." He refers to these latter characters in the following verses, in contrast

with those with whom the Lord would not *contend forever.* "*But* [says he, showing the contrast,] the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no *peace* to the wicked, saith my God." [Verses 20, 21.] If a man is wicked all his life, he has no *peace.* If he should die, and go into eternity wicked, still he has no *peace.* If he is raised from the dead wicked (which he will be, as we shall hereafter prove,) then he will remain without peace, and continue like the troubled sea when it cannot *rest.* Thus the context is against Universalism in both cases, which is another case of *Universalism against itself.*

3. But we have *Universalism still more against itself* in trying to make these two texts testify in its favor. By doing so, it admits that *forever*, and "*cast off forever*," means to all eternity. It would not suit the theory at all, to say that *forever* means a limited duration. Let us try it. "The Lord will not cast off for a *little while.*" This will not work, for Universalists contend that the Lord does cast off a little while, but he will not *cast off forever*, i. e. eternally. Very good. Hear now what David says to Solomon: "If thou seek him he will be found of thee, but *if* thou forsake him he will *cast thee off forever.*" [1. Chron. 28, 9.] That is, he will *cast thee off to all eternity*, which this application of the passage admits to be the correct meaning of that phrase!

12. Ezek. 33. 11. Say unto them: as I live saith the Lord God; I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.

1. This text is quoted by Universalists to prove that none will be finally lost. They must therefore necessarily admit that the *dying* here spoken of refers to an *eternal death* beyond the grave as this is what they quote it to disprove.

2. Here *Universalism is against itself* by the admission, for the remainder of the verse proves conclusively, that the wicked would *die* that *death*, or be finally lost, unless they returned. "*Turn ye, turn ye*, from your evil ways; for *why will you die?*" This difficulty cannot be evaded by denying this death to refer to the future state: for mark the fact, Universalists start out upon the assumption that God's pleasure cannot be frustrated; and it is his pleasure that the wicked *should not die;* hence it *cannot* mean the death of the body, or a death in sin; for they admit that they *do die these deaths;* it cannot therefore have this meaning, as the pleasure of God would thus be frustrated. There is therefore no other ground left that they can take, according to their views of the pleasure of God, but to refer this *death* to the future state of existence.

3. But we can prove that it refers to the future and eternal death without such admission. 1. It cannot mean the natural death of the body, for *that* the righteous have to suffer as well as the wicked:—neither can the wicked avoid it by turning from their wicked

ways, which is the case with the death here referred to. 2. It cannot signify a moral death or death in sin, for this reason: The wicked whom the Lord addressed were *then* dead in trespasses and in sins; and still they had not died the death here spoken of, for he says: "Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways, for *why will you die?*" In the future, not why *are you dead?* or why do you *remain dead?* which would have been the case, had he spoken of a moral death. Hence there is no other logical ground to take than that it has direct reference to an eternal death beyond the present life.

4. But says the objector: if this death does refer to the future state, no one need fear it; for God declares he has no pleasure in it. We will prove, however, that the pleasure of the Lord is, and has been frustrated in many instances. First, as God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, either his pleasure is frustrated, or else the text does not refer to any death to be inflicted in this present state of existence. This no man can get over. If however it refers to the future state, then the wicked will die this death unless they *turn from their evil ways.* But in the next place, there are many things contrary to God's pleasure: "I have *no pleasure in you,* saith the Lord of hosts; neither will I accept an offering at your hands." [Mal. 1. 10.] Here the Jews acted contrary to the pleasure of God, and hence his pleasure was frustrated. Again: "For thou art not a God, that hast *pleasure* in wickedness." [Ps. 5. 4.] As God has no *pleasure* in wickedness, it follows that in every sin a man commits, he frustrates the *pleasure* of God.—"Without faith it is impossible to *please* God." [Heb. 11. 6.] "Howbeit with many of them God was not *well pleased.*" [1. Cor. 10. 5.] "But to do good, and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is *well pleased.*" [Heb. 13. 16.] "The Lord taketh *pleasure* in them that *fear* him." [Ps. 147. 11.] "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no *pleasure* in him." [Heb. 10. 38.] These passages show that God has *pleasure* in some things and some persons, and has no *pleasure* in others: which proves that things are frequently contrary to his pleasure: and from this it follows that the wicked may, and actually will die the second, and eternal death unless they return from their evil ways, although God has *no pleasure* in such death.

**13.** Mal. 2. 10. Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?

1. Upon this text Universalists base their argument of God's Universal paternity;—that God is the father of the whole human family; and consequently that all will be saved.

I admit the premises:—that God is the father of the whole human family in the sense of this text, i. e., because he has *created* them; but I deny the conclusion.—God is just as much *now* the father of *all mankind, as he* ever will be, and yet all are not now saved. God

has always been the father of mankind in this sense: and yet sin and misery have always existed. If the fact that God is our father will eventually destroy sin and misery, why did not that fact prevent its existence altogether? If God is the father of all, and will permit, and even foreordain his dear children to be sinful and miserable three score and ten years, as Universalists contend, what good reason can be assigned why he may not continue the same paternal regard over them to all eternity?—The very fact that God is immutable proves that he will do it; and thus we have *Universalism against itself* by taking the above position and coupling it with God's unchangeability.

2. But God is the father of the whole brute creation in the same sense that he is the father of all mankind; that is by *creation*. Will all the animal tribes be made holy and happy in heaven? According to the doctrine of Universal paternity they will. But it is said the paternal character of God is confined to the intelligent or rational creation, for he is called: "The God of the *spirits of all flesh*." [Num. 27. 16.] But are not beasts as well as men, embraced in the phrase, *all flesh?* Let us read: "And *all flesh* died that moved upon the earth, both of *fowl*, and of *cattle*, and of *beasts*, and of every *creeping thing* that creepeth upon the earth." [Gen. 7. 21.] Paul testifies the same thing: "All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of *men*, another of *beasts*, another of *fishes*, and another of *birds*." [1 Cor. 15. 39.] So, if the phrase *all flesh* proves the salvation of all mankind, it proves the salvation of every beast, fowl, fish and creeping thing! But, says the objector, "he is the God of the *spirits* of all flesh." Have beasts spirits? Hear Solomon: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the *spirit* of the *beast* that goeth downward to the earth." [Ec. 3. 21.]

3. Our being the children of God by Nature secures only the blessings of Providence: but there are blessings of a higher order,—the spiritual blessings, which are to be enjoyed through the sufferings death and mediation of the Saviour; and in order to do this, we must become the children of God in a higher sense than that of Nature,—by *adoption* into the family of God. In this sense a man has to be more than born of the flesh, to be constituted a child. He must be born again—"born of water, and of the *spirit*," [John 3. 5.] in order to "receive the spirit of *adoption* by which we cry Abba, Father." [Rom. 8. 15.] Hence says Paul: "They which are the children of the *flesh*, these are not the *children of God*." [Rom. 9. 8.] But in order to become the children of God in this more exalted sense, he informs us that we must submit to the government of Christ. "For as many as are *led* by the Spirit of God, they are the *sons of God*." [Rom. 8. 14.] "We are all the *children of God by faith* in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." [Gal. 3. 26, 27.] "Do all things without murmurings and disputings, that you may be blameless and harmless, the *sons of God*." [Phil. 2. 14, 15.] "Wherefore come

out from amongst them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be a *father* unto you, and you shall be my *sons* and *daughters*, saith the Lord Almighty." [2 Cor. 6. 17, 18.] "For whosoever shall do the will of my father which is in heaven, the same is my *brother* and *sister* and *mother;*" [Math. 12. 50.] and consequently are the children of God. "He that *overcometh* shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be *my son*." [Rev. 21. 7.] From the above scriptures we draw the conclusion, that none can sustain towards God the spiritual relation of children, without submitting to the terms of reconciliation.

4. But all men are not the children of God in a spiritual sense; for some are the children of the devil; and as God and the devil are put in contrast in the scriptures, the one representing all good, the other all evil: hence those who are the children of the devil cannot be the children of God in that important sense. Jesus positively declares: "Ye cannot serve *God* and *mammon;*" (Math. 6. 24.) and for this reason, they are diametrically opposed; and for the same reason, no man can be a child of *God*, and a child of the *devil*, at the same time. This proposition is clearly sustained by the word: "Jesus said unto them: *if God were your father*, ye would love me,—ye are of *your father, the devil*, and the lusts of your father ye will do." (John 8. 42, 44.) "The field is the world: the *good seed* are the children of the *kingdom; but the tares* are the children of the *wicked one*." (Math. 13. 38.)—"O full of all subtilty and all mischief; thou *child of the devil;* thou enemy of *all righteousness*." (Acts 13. 10.) "In this *the children of God* are manifested, and the *children of the devil*: whosoever doeth not righteousness *is not of God*." (1 John 3. 10.) From this it can be seen that those who are the children of *God*, cannot be the children of the *devil;* no more can those who are the children of the *devil* be the children of *God* at one and the same time. But what this *devil* is, we shall hereafter endeavor to show.

5. Upon this subject we have said nearly enough for the present. How Universalists can build universal salvation upon this proof-text, is more than I can see. The fact that men are now the children of God as Universalists contend, and are now sinful and miserable as they have to admit, is an insurmountable barrier and will forever be in the way of Universalism. Men are now sinful from one of two considerations: either God *cannot*, or *will not* save them. Say he *cannot;* and it follows that he never can without their aid, for infinite power cannot be increased. But say he *will not*, and it follows that he never will unless men change their actions, for he is "without variableness or shadow of turning." [James 1. 17.]

14. Math. 1. 21. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he *shall save his people* from their sins.

Before this text can be made to favor Universalism, two things must be proved 1. That *his people*, here signifies the whole human family; and 2. that *shall* is used unconditionally or that there is not a condition implied as in the promise to Abraham. Neither of these can be done.

1. Christ possesses men in three senses; first: in the sense of dominion or power, which he has a right to exercise over them. This extends to all, and to this apply the following scriptures: "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." [Ps. 2. 8.] "As thou hast given him power over all flesh." [John 17. 2.] "The father loveth the son, and hath given all things into his hands." (John 3. 35.) "His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the rivers even to the ends of the earth." (Zech. 9. 10.) "And Jesus came and spake unto them saying: all power in heaven and in earth is given unto me." (Math. 28. 18.)

2. Christ possesses men in the sense of consanguinity. Thus it is said: "He came unto his *own* and his own received him not." (John 1. 11.) i. e. his own brethren according to the flesh,—the Jewish nation. This is undoubtedly the sense of the text. "he shall save *his people* from their sins," that is, he shall save the children of Israel from their sins, upon the condition of reformation: this the apostle Peter declares in language which confirms the truth of this exegesis. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a *Saviour*, to give *repentance* to *Israel*, and the *forgiveness of sins*." (Acts 5. 31.)

Thus, Christ is a *Saviour*, and he will save *Israel* his people, by *forgiving their sins*, upon the condition of their exercising "*repentance* unto life." (Acts 11. 18.)

3. Christ owns persons in the sense of spiritual relationship,—as "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." [Eph. 5. 30.] With reference to this it is said: "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." [Rom. 8. 9.] Christ's people in this sense are already saved from sin, whenever they become his; and hence, the saving of *his people*, in the text, cannot refer to those who are spiritually his, but to his Jewish brethren, as we have seen. Hence we hear it said concerning John the Baptist: "And thou child shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the *Lord* to prepare *his* ways, to give knowledge of salvation to *his people* by the remission of their sins." [Luke 1. 76, 77.] Thus John the Baptist was sent to the Lord's people, who were, as admitted by all, the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And the way they were saved from their sins under the ministry of John, Christ

and the apostles, was by submitting to the terms of pardon, which they severally made obligatory upon them.

As Christ saves no man from sin here, only upon the principle of voluntary obedience, what will become of those who die in their sins? Before Universalists can prove them saved, they must prove three things.

1. That God will give them laws in eternity, by which they can be brought into his favor.

2. That those who die in their sins, will after that possess the power of volition; and

3. That they will exercise that power in voluntary obedience. If they possess the power of volition, how do we know but that they will voluntary choose to continue in sin, in the next world, as well as in this since "wicked men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived?" [2 Tim. 13.]

One passage more: When Christ sent forth his apostles to preach to *his people*,—the *Jews* first, and then to the Gentiles, the way by which they could be *saved* from their sins, he laid down this principle: "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved.*" (Mark 16. 16.) All admit this to be a salvation from sin; and hence salvation from sin is conditional. Query. Can a man be saved in heaven, without being saved from sin? Certainly not. Then heaven is conditional. But it is said this refers to time: yes, and to eternity likewise, for suppose a man is saved from his sins according to the above principle,—lives saved all his life, and dies saved; will he not remain saved eternally? Yes. And upon the same principle, if a man is damned here in time, lives damned all his life, and dies damned, he will continue damned forever, will he not? The same plan Universalists will adopt to get a man saved after he dies damned, I will also adopt to get him damned after he dies saved!

**15.** Math 5. 17. 18. Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill; for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

In connection with this text Universalists generally quote Rom. 13. 10. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." The argument then stands thus: The law here referred to, is universal and eternal; and as "love is the fulfilling of the law," and as one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled; it follows that all men universally will be brought *to love God;* for this is the fulfilling of the law. This, though considered a strong argument, is nevertheless, like most others claimed to favor this doctrine based upon a radical mistake. Two texts are jumbled together having no reference to the same thing: and this makes out the case. Well upon *this principle* we could prove that oxen as well as men will be

saved: for example: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn," "for of such is the kingdom of heaven." This is all scripture, just as much as in the other case, and about as much in connection.

In the first text (Math. 5. 17, 18,) the Saviour testifies that he came to fulfill the law and the prophets; that is, he came to be the great antitype, to which all sacrifices and offerings in the law pointed; and to verify the predictions of all the prophets concerning himself; and he also says, that "not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled: " that is, till all the types and predictions were fulfilled which referred to him. This has no reference to any other character than the Lord Jesus Christ, and he did fulfill every jot and tittle of that law in his own person. Hence that law is not left for us to fulfill; for Christ himself came to fulfill it, and "he finished the work God gave him to do," (Jo. 17, 4,) when he "took it [the ceremonial law] out of the way, nailing it to his cross." (Col. 2, 14.) But there is another *law*, which is commonly called the moral law, or the law which binds moral obligations between man and man. "Love is the fulfilling of *this law;*" and every man is morally bound to *fulfill* it; yet hundreds and thousands break it, and live in the open violation of it, all their lives; and consequently die and go into eternity without fulfilling the law of love: and as Universalists contend that this law is *eternal* (i. e. endless,) of course the penalty for disobeying it must also be eternal (for the penalty, in one sense, is a component of the law) and thus *Universalism is against itself* in quoting this text. Yes, says Paul; "If any man *love not* the Lord Jesus Christ [i. e. does not fulfill the law of love,] let him be *accursed* when the Lord shall come" (1 Cor. 16. 22.), that is, let him receive the *eternal penalty* necessarily annexed to this *eternal law* of love.

So Universalists gain nothing by this argument; for James says: "Whoso shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (Jam. 2. 10.) Hence no individual can be said truly, and strictly to fulfill the *Royal law*, who even breaks a single command; but Christ could be said to fulfill the law concerning himself from the fact that he never transgressed in a single instance, or left one type or prediction unfulfilled.

16. Math. 5. 44, 45. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that you may be the children of your father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust.

Universalists consider this passage very strong ground in their favor; but it is as far from Universalism as the north is from the south. The Saviour here refers only to temporal things, and not to

those things which relate to God's spiritual or moral government. This is clear, from the fact that he gives us a sample of God's goodness to his enemies: "He maketh his *sun* to rise on the evil and good, and sendeth *rain* on the just and on the unjust."

God is thus good to the wicked, in giving them the means by which they can procure bread and enjoy physical comfort; but suppose they will not cultivate the soil, and improve the early and latter rains, which God so richly pours down upon the earth, will God keep them from starving? No, for Solomon says: "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold, therefore he shall beg for bread in harvest and have nothing." (Prov. 20. 4.) And under the gospel dispensation, Paul taught the same doctrine: "If any man will not work neither shall he eat;" (2 Thess. 3. 10.) and Paul would not pity him, neither would God, if he should starve to death. Thus we are to imitate our father in heaven: we are to give our enemies food and raiment if they stand in need; but if they will not receive them, it is their own fault if they perish, and not ours. And here again Universalism is completely *against itself*, by making the dealings of God in Nature illustrative of his dealings with reference to spiritual things. For upon this principle, just as certain as God will let a man starve unless he attend to the means appointed in Nature to procure food and shelter, just so certain will he let him die a second and eternal death, if he refuse to make use of the means of grace in order to secure the incorruptible inheritance. Universalists are compelled to admit this, or forever abandon their application of the above text. They tell us that God has always done good to the wicked, and we are to imitate him in this respect. Then accordingly, if we pour fire and brimstone upon our enemies' heads, till we have consumed them, we are doing them *good!* Should we send an army upon them and hew them in pieces, as did God with the wicked Jews, we would only be giving them an exhibition of our long suffering and tender mercy! Should we cause them to "die *without mercy* under two or three witnesses;" and punish them with an *everlasting destruction;* it is but another name for goodness or benevolence!

But Universalists would tell us we were not doing our enemies good in this way; yet according to their doctrine, God has a thousand times done the wicked *good* in this very way.

But suppose we admit (which we cheerfully do) that God *is* good to the wicked in a moral point of view, it does nothing for Universalism; for he *is* just as *good now* as he ever will be; yet, notwithstanding his present goodness, thousands live the most wretched and miserable lives, and die the most degraded and infamous deaths, and thus go into eternity in their sins; and unless God should become better in the future than he is now, they must necessarily remain so eternally.

God loves his enemies morally and spiritually, but when they be-

come incorrigible, he gives them over to hardness of heart and a reprobate mind, to believe a lie and be damned; which he would not do if the blessings of God's love did not depend upon conditions.

But 1. He has no regard for such characters. Proof: "I *regarded them not*, saith the Lord." (Heb. 8. 9.)

2. He will show them no mercy. Proof: "He that made them, *will not have mercy upon them.*" (Is. 27. 11.)

3. They shall be forever debarred from his favor.—Proof: "He that formed them, *will show them no favor.* (Ibid.)

4. God *hates* them. Proof: "Thou *hatest* all workers of iniquity." (Ps. 5. 5.) "The Lord trieth the righteous: but the wicked and him that loveth violence, his soul *hateth.*" (Ps. 11. 5.)

5. He *despises* them. Proof: "Thou hast put them to shame; because God hath *despised* them." (Ps. 53. 5.) "And hath *despised* in the *indignation* of his *anger*, the king and the priest." [Lam. 2. 6.]

6. God *abhors* them. Proof: "When the Lord saw it he *abhorred* them." [Deu. 32. 19.]

Here then we have the plain testimony concerning the wicked, who delight in working abominations; that he *regards* them not,—that he will not have *mercy* upon them,—that he will show them no *favor*,—that he *hates* them,—that he *despises* them, and that he *abhors* them! This, it is claimed, is highly figurative language. Granted; but figures always represent realities that at least resemble the figurative expressions. Will Universalists kindly intimate the realities intended to be conveyed by this language and show how they can be made to harmonize with the broad doctrine of universal salvation?

17. Math. 22. 30. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

Luke 20. 34–36. The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

1. The principal point in these texts relied on as proof of Universalism, is the sentence:—"*They are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.*" But does this prove the doctrine? Let us examine it. Who are "*they*" that are equal unto the angels? and who are "*they*" that are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection? This is an important inquiry; and one upon which the whole issue turns. Universalists take the position that "*they*" embraces the whole human family; but the Saviour tells us that "*they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world*," are the characters who "are equal unto the an-

gels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." This sentence,—"They that shall be *accounted worthy* to *obtain* that world," proves positively that some will not be accounted worthy: although Universalists have tried in vain to reconcile such language, with the assumption that *all* will be accounted worthy! Reader, how would you understand such a sentence as this? "They that were *accounted worthy* were admitted into the feast." Would you not understand that some *were not* accounted worthy and that some were not admitted? Most certainly you would. The Saviour shows, that to be counted worthy of a thing, requires action and preparation on our part: "Watch ye therefore, and pray always, *that ye may be accounted worthy.*" [Luke 21. 36.] Paul tells the Thessalonians, that they had endured tribulation and persecution, "*That ye may be counted worthy* of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer." [2 Thes. 1. 5.] Thus the phrase "*counted worthy*" is proved by Christ and the apostles, to presuppose a personal preparation. This is a plain instance of *Universalism against itself.*

2. We remarked that only *some* Universalists take the above ground; for it is true that many of them do not take it but tell us that the phrase "*counted worthy*" is omitted by Matthew and Mark in recording the same conversation; and mentioned only by Luke: hence it must have been a matter of little importance, or Matthew and Mark would not have omitted it! But we now turn their logic against them. Take notice: the very originators of this quibble, build their whole argument upon the sentence—"they are the children of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." This however must have been a matter of little or no importance, themselves being judges; for Matthew and Mark have omitted that part altogether! Yes, Matthew and Mark have both omitted the very foundation upon which Universalists build their theory!

3. But what is to be done with the sentence—"they are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection?" Does it prove Universalism? We shall show that it does not. And first we remark, that we *believe* it; notwithstanding Luke is alone; just as much as though he had Matthew, Mark and John with him. But suppose we admit that all mankind are to be children of God, being the children of the resurrection; does it follow that they will all be holy and happy? By no means: for according to Universalism, *All men* now are the children of God: yet many have lived and died sinners; guilty, miserable and condemned. What then becomes of the logic? They can be the children of God in the resurrection, and be sinful and miserable, just upon the same principle that they can be here; and God can then destroy them with fire and brimstone, just as consistently as he once did his dear children who lived in the city of Sodom!

4. But Universalists are possibly aware that the scriptures speak of *two resurrections;* one for those who die in Christ, and the other for those who die in their sins: one for the just, and the other for the

unjust: one to life, and the other to condemnation. The first of these is to be *obtained* by the Christian character we form in this life; and is called "*the resurrection of the dead.*" Paul suffered the loss of all things, as he declares, "If by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection* of the dead." [Ph. 3. 11.] This must have been *the resurrection* of the just, or the *first resurrection*, as he would have obtained the other without any exertion whatever to serve the Lord. It is the same resurrection, for which Paul was striving, as the one spoken of in Heb. 11. 35. "Women received their children raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; *that they might obtain a better resurrection.*" This corresponds precisely with the passage in Luke: "They that shall be *counted worthy to obtain* that world, and *the resurrection* of the dead." Mark that word *obtain*, and then read again Heb. 11. 35. "others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might *obtain a better resurrection.*" The very best thing Universalists have said upon this text, in order to evade the difficulty which it manifestly presents to their doctrine, is, that the *better resurrection* is to be understood, as *better* than the resurrection of the *children* spoken of in the first part of that verse. Admit it, and what follows? Why, had they not held fast their integrity, they would not have obtained a better resurrection than the children experienced; which was a resurrection to a state of sin, suffering, corruption and death.

Now since Paul labored to obtain "*the resurrection of the dead,*" and others suffered cruel persecutions "that they might *obtain a better resurrection*" than the one they would have obtained, had they not suffered; it follows hence, that "they which shall be *counted worthy to obtain* that world, and *the resurrection,*" has reference only to the "*resurrection of the just,*" or the "*first* resurrection," which Paul labored to *obtain;* or the "*better* resurrection," which the martyrs considered they had to *obtain* by holding out faithful to the end. Hence we read concerning them: "These all died *in faith;*" [Heb. 11. 12.] and for this reason, "God hath prepared for them *a city,*" [verse 16.] Not the city of Jerusalem, for that they did not obtain: but it was "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." [verse 10.] Those then, who by their faithfulness obtain that city, and the better resurrection, will be the ones who "shall be *counted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection of the dead.*"

5. If Universalists could prove that all mankind would be *in the resurrection* here referred to it would not follow that all would be the children of the resurrection. The Saviour informs us, that "the *good seed* are the *children* of the *kingdom,*" and the angels, "shall gather *out of his kingdom* all things that *offend* and them which *do iniquity.*" [Math. 13. 38, 41.] Thus we discover, that some who are in the kingdom, are not the good seed, and consequently are not the "*children of the kingdom.*" On the same principle many may be in

the resurrection, who are not the *children of the resurrection*, because they are not the *good seed of the kingdom.*

6. But suppose we explain this whole passage as Universalists are in the habit of doing with texts as pointed and as literal as this. 1. Then we will understand, "this world" and "that world," to mean the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as Universalists understand and interpret Math. 12. 32. The very way they will prove "this world" and "that world" to mean this and the future state of existence in this proof-text, I can adopt to prove "this world and that which is to come"—[Math. 12. 32] to mean the same thing, which breaks down Universalism. 2. "Neither marry nor are given in marriage," is a prophesy referring to Catholic priests; and "the resurrection from the dead," which they are to obtain in order to this state of celibacy, means either conversion (as Universalists interpret John 5. 29.) or being exalted to the priest's office. 3. "They are equal unto the angels" "in heaven," signifies that they are equal unto the *Roman soldiers* in *Jerusalem* (as Universalists interpret Math. 25. 31.). And 4. "Neither can they die any more," means that the Catholic priests who are under the absolute dominion of the Pope can never renounce their faith and apostatize from Catholicism. I challenge Universalists to refute this exposition, for in doing it they will refute themselves: because it is only a sample of their own method of interpreting numerous passages which oppose their theory.

7. It is admitted, according to the Universalist application of this text, that "*this world*" means this state of existence. We will now quote another text with this definition before us: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of *this world*," (Math. 13. 40.) i. e. in the end of this state of existence, or the end of time! Then, as Universalists are compelled to admit by their own use of this phrase, will be the separation of the righteous from the wicked.

8. They admit, further, that the word *resurrection*, means coming forth to the immortal state of existence. We admit the same. Then we read: "They that have done good, [shall come forth] to the *resurrection* of life; and they that have done evil to the *resurrection* of *damnation*." (John 5. 29.) And thus again we have *Universalism against itself.*

9. *Angels* signify immortal spirits of light. This they admit without hesitancy when the passage suits them! Then we read: 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his *angels* [not the Roman soldiers,] and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Math. 16. 27.) Again *Universalism against itself.*

10. They admit also that *heaven* means the immortal state of bliss. This admission proves fatal to their theory; for the Saviour says: "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your *reward in heaven.*" [Math. 5. 12.]

18. Luke 2. 10, 11. And the angel said unto them : fear not, for behold I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people ; for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

1. It is one thing to bring good tidings of great joy *to* a man, and it is another thing for him to accept them. Twelve men are sentenced to the penitentiary for life ; but after a few years the governor pardons them. A messenger is dispatched to bear the good news to the unhappy convicts. The prison doors fly open, and he proclaims in their ears, as did the angel: Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to you twelve ; for the governor has this day signed your pardon, and you now have the privilege of being released from your confinement! Six of them gladly receive his word, obey the call and come out of the prison: but the other six are wholly indifferent about the matter, and contend that the governor is so good and so benevolent he would not see them die there, but that he will finally come and carry them out ; and hence it is no difference whether they *go* out or not! They consequently keep putting the matter off until they die; and thus they never enjoy the benefit of the glad tidings which were brought to them from the governor. So the apostles were sent forth to bear good tidings of great joy to all people. It was also foretold by the prophet and quoted by Paul: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace ; and bring *glad tidings* of good things." [Rom. 10. 15.] But who ever heard of the apostles telling men that these good tidings of great joy which they preached would benefit them without their being accepted? Invariably wherever they went they proclaimed this gospel upon the conditions that man would accept and obey it. But no such good tidings as Universalists preach were ever proclaimed to sinners by any apostle or evangelist of the Lord.

2. But are Universalists certain that the phrase *all people* means the whole human family? Dare they risk their salvation upon it? We will see: "And the Lord shall scatter thee among *all people.*" [Deu. 28. 64.] Does *all people* here signify the entire race of Adam? If so, who were these Jews that were to be scattered among them?— Again: "The Jews gathered themselves together in their cities, throughout all the provinces of the King Ahasuerus, to lay hand on such as sought their hurt ; and no man could withstand them, for the fear of them fell upon *all people.*" [Est. 9. 2.] Did the fear of the Jews fall upon the whole human family, when a thousandth part of them was not in existence? Thus we may have a thousand probabilities that Universalism is not true where there is one in its favor. Once more: "And for the majesty that he gave him *all people*, nations and languages trembled and feared before him." [Dan. 5. 19.] Did the entire race of Adam fear and tremble before Nebuchadnezzar? Did Universalists fear and tremble before him? If

not, then they might be no part of *all people;* and therefore might not be embraced in *their Universal Salvation!*

**19.** John 1. 29. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

1. This text comes far short of proving Universalism. If Christ should take away but *one man's sins*, it would be the sin of the world, as it would not be the sin of the church nor of any thing else. He does not say, behold the Lamb of God that taketh away all the sins of the world! This would make the matter quite different. Sins are taken away only by forgiveness; and as forgiveness of sins was preached by the apostles to all nations invariably and only upon the condition of submitting to the gospel, it follows that those who will not submit to the gospel, but persist in their rebellion against God until they die in their sins will never be forgiven; and consequently the sins of such individuals Christ will never take away. Christ has plainly taught that some men's sins will not be forgiven. "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly father forgive your trespasses." [Math. 6. 15.] Some men live all their lives with bitter enmity in their hearts toward their fellow men, and die without forgiving them! If the Saviour's words are to be believed, such characters will not be forgiven; and consequently Christ will not take away their sins.

2. But Universalists admit enough, by quoting this text, to condemn their theory. They must necessarily admit that "*the world*" means the whole human family; for unless it mean this, why talk about its proving Universalism? Having thus learned the signification of "*the world*," we will read another text with a similar application. "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commands all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day, in the which *he will judge the world*," i. e. the *whole human family.* This judgment was to be sometime in the future: "*will* judge," not *has* judged *is* judging and *will* judge the world! But *the world*—the whole human family—*will* be judged at some future period, which cannot be till the *resurrection of the dead*, when the entire posterity of Adam shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

**20.** John 4. 42. We have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

1 John 4. 14. We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.

1. Universalists quote these texts, and then ask with confidence: Can Christ be the Saviour of the world, and the world not be saved? We answer yes, and we think we can make Universalists admit it. Christ was the Saviour of the world 1800 years ago, for the text

speaks of him thus in the present tense. Yet the world was not then saved. He has been the Saviour of the world ever since, and there has never been a time when the world was saved; and upon the same principle, he may be the Saviour of the world till the day of doom, and the world not be saved. If Christ can be the Saviour of the world at one time and the world not saved, it will require better logic then Universalists possess to prove that he may not be the Saviour of the world at any other time, and yet the world remain unsaved. If the fact that Christ is the Saviour of the world will ever save the world, why will it not do the work at once and have done with it?

2. Universalists admit that none are now saved, notwithstanding Christ is now the Saviour of the world, only such as submit to his government; and as "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," [Heb. 13. 8.] it follows that none will ever be saved only on this principle. And as in eternity faith is swallowed up in sight and obedience to the commands of the gospel cannot be attended to, it follows that they cannot be saved there. I am aware that some Universalists contend that the commands which are not obeyed here, will be obeyed in the future state of being. This however is impossible. Will the wicked be permitted to attend to the ordinances in that world? Will they "meet together on the *first day of the week*" in eternity, and "exhort one another and so much the more as they see the day approaching? Will they "feed the *hungry* and clothe the *naked*" in eternity?! Will they "visit the *fatherless* and the *widows*" in eternity?!! And finally; will they "work while it is called *to-day*" in eternity?!! Does the apostle refer to eternity, when he says "*now* is the accepted time and *now* is the day of salvation?"

3. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." Universalists ask: Will not Christ do the work for which he was sent? We ask in return: Was not Christ sent to make all men love one another in this life? Yes. Do they love one another? No. Christ came to cause many things to be done that are not done, nor ever will be to all eternity. For instance: he came to make men love their wives; yet some men do not love their wives till they go into eternity: and they cannot love them there, for that relation will no more be known,—"they will neither marry nor be given in marriage;" hence it will never be done at all. Again we read: "For the Son of man is come to seek and save that which was lost." [Luke 19. 10.] Did Christ come to save men with respect to eternity, or only with respect to time? If with respect to time only: then those passages which speak of Christ as the Saviour of the world, will not apply to eternity, and consequently have nothing to do with Universalism, for all know that the world is not saved in time.

But if he came to save men with respect to eternity; then they were lost with respect to eternity, for he came to seek and to save

that which was lost.—And as they were eternally lost without Christ's coming to save them, then it must have been on account of their sins; and if men can act *here in time* so as to lose themselves in eternity, then upon the same principle if they are saved in eternity, it must be by their conduct *in this life.*

4. As Christ came the first time to save men from their sins, they must be saved here in this life, or remain lost, for he will come the second time to judge the world, not to save it. The Father will not send his Son twice upon the same errand, be assured; and those who put off being saved from their sins till the Lord comes to raise the dead and judge the world, will find themselves too late, unless it so turns out that Christ comes twice for the same thing, which is scarcely probable.

5. As regards those passages which speak of Christ as the Saviour of the world: we have them all explained by another text: "For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him *might be saved.*" [John 3. 17.] The word "*might*" explains the whole matter. This we understand to be the sense, in which Christ is the Saviour of the world.—Christ has made an atonement and ordained a system of salvation by which the world *may* be saved, if they *will.* The word *might*, shows that men have an opportunity to be saved, and that they may be if they choose; and also that they may be damned if they prefer it. The word *might* is frequently used in this sense.—The Saviour says: "For judgment am I come into this world, that they which see not *might* see, and that they which see *might* be made blind." [John 9. 39.]

This will suffice to show the candid reader that men may be saved if they choose, and in this sense only is Christ the Saviour of the world.

**21.** John 6. 39. And this is the Father's will that sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.

Before this can be made to favor Universalism, two things must be proved: 1. That it is not in the power of man to frustrate the will of God; And 2. That the whole human family are given to Christ in the sense here intended. Neither of these can be proved.

1. The will of God is not always done. Proof: "This is the *will of God* even your *sanctification*, that ye should *abstain* from *fornication*;—that no man *go beyond* and *defraud* his brother in *any matter.*" [1 Thess. 4. 3–6.] Is the will of God always done in these respects? Again: "*Pray without ceasing*, and in *every thing give thanks*; for this is the *will of God* in Christ Jesus concerning you." [1 Thess. 5. 17, 18.] Dare Universalists read this text and say the will of God is always done? The reason why the will of God is not always done is because it partly belongs to man to do, and he does just as he feels disposed about his part of it. The Saviour says: "Not every one

that sayeth unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth the will of my Father* which is in heaven." [Math. 7. 21.] "Whosoever shall *do the will of my Father* which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." [Math. 12. 50.] "The world passeth away, and the lusts thereof; but he that *doeth the will of God*, abideth forever." [1 Jo. 2. 17.] "For so is the *will of God*, that with *well doing*, ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." [1 Pet. 2. 15.] "Now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshiper of God, and *doeth his will;* him he heareth." [John 9. 31.] The Saviour says to Jerusalem: "How often *would* I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings; and ye *would not.*" [Luke 13. 34.] From these texts we discover, that as far as concerns the happiness of man the will of God is conditional, and depends upon human conduct for its accomplishment.

2. Are the whole human family given to Christ in the sense of this text? We think not. Who is it that is given to Christ, whom he will raise up at the last day? The context will decide: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and *believeth* on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise *him* up at the last day." [Verse 40.] Thus the text has reference to those who are given to Christ in a spiritual sense, who are *believers*, and not of the *world.* Proof: "I pray not for the *world*, but for them which thou hast *given* me." [John 17. 9.] Thus we learn that believers are the ones who are given to Christ in a spiritual sense, and he will raise such up at the last day if they hold out faithful in doing the will of God. (See also examination of Math. 1. 21.)

But *Universalism is against itself* in two respects, in its application of this text. 1. It is admitted that *lose* refers to eternity, and means an endless separation from God. This must be its meaning negatively, for Universalists quote it to disprove that doctrine! It cannot mean the destruction of Jerusalem, for then Universalists would be building up with one hand and tearing down with the other, as they acknowledge that many were lost at that siege. Hence it must necessarily refer to the future state.—Now is it not a little singular that the Saviour should keep talking about men being eternally lost; and that it was the will of the father that none should be thus eternally *lost;* while in the next verse he tells them that in order that the will of God may stand, and that they may escape being thus *lost*, they must believe on the Son; and promises to raise such up to himself at the last day?—Is it not singular, I ask, that the Saviour should thus talk about the possibility of men being eternally *lost*, as Universalists have to admit he did, and yet that such an idea as final condemnation never entered the mind of God, and that no sinner was ever in any danger of such a thing since the foundation of the world? But as they thus admit the word lose to

signify eternal separation from *God*, we will read another text with this definition: "Those that thou hast given me I have kept: and none of them is *lost*, but the *son of perdition*." [Jo. 17. 12.) Notwithstanding the text declares that it was the Father's will that of all he had given Christ none should be lost (eternally of course) the Saviour declares as above quoted, that out of the number given him *one was lost*,—the son of perdition, who, as we read, went "to his own place." [Ac. 1. 25.] and the Saviour declares concerning him: "Good were it for that man, if he had never been born." [Mark 14. 21.]

2. They admit that "*the last day*," refers to the resurrection. Grant it. Then we read: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall *judge* him in *the last day*!" (Jo. 12. 48.) This admission proves the judgment day to be at the resurrection of the dead: and thus Universalists abandon their doctrine every time they quote this text to sustain it.

22. John 12. 32. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw* all men unto me.

John 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

Before Universalists can make these texts favor their doctrine, they must prove six things.

1. That the *drawing* here referred to is compulsatory.

2. That it is to be accomplished in the future state and not in this.

3. That the lifting up of Christ from the earth, here referred to, has not yet been accomplished and will not be till the resurrection of the dead.

4. That *all men* means the whole human family.

5. That the whole human family are given to Christ in the sense of this second text; and

6. That "*will draw*" and "*shall come*" are unconditional, or that there is not an *if* implied as in the promise to Abraham.

This must all be done before these texts will favor Universalism, and a failure in any one of the six points destroys the argument. Let us now examine them:

1. The word *draw* is used in the sense of *invite*, and hence cannot be compulsatory. We have this word explained by the Saviour: "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me *draw* him." [Jo. 6. 44.] Now how is this drawing to be affected? Read the next verse: "It is written in the prophets: And they shall all be *taught* of God. Every man therefore that hath *heard*, and hath *learned* of the father, cometh unto me." Thus it is that Christ *draws* men,—by teaching, calling, and inviting them unto himself.

2. This *drawing* is to be effected here in time; because here men are to be taught of God and learn the will of the father; and

3. Because Christ has been already lifted up from the earth ever since he rose from the dead. It cannot mean that Christ will be lifted up from the earth at the resurrection of the dead; for then he will come from heaven, not to be lifted up; but to lift up the saints, or those that the father hath drawn to him by teaching, as he declares: "No man can come to me except the father which hath sent me *draw* him, and I will *raise him up at the last day.*"

4. *All men* does not necessarily mean the whole human family. Universalists cannot prove that it has this meaning in any passage in the Bible, except where it speaks of God as the creator of *all men.* A few instances will be given.

"And ye shall be hated of *all men* for my name's sake." [Math. 10. 22.] Did the entire race of Adam hate the apostles? Will Universalists acknowledge that they hate them? "*All men* counted John, that he was a prophet." [Mark 11. 32.] Did the whole human family count John a prophet when not one million millionth part of them ever saw him or knew any thing about him? Once more: "Many of them also which used curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them before *all men.*" [Ac. 19. 19.] Did Universalists see them burn their books? If not, then they are no part of *all men,* and will not therefore be *drawn* to Christ!

5. The whole human family are not given to Christ in the sense here intended. If the phrase, "all that the Father giveth me," is to be understood in the sense of dominion and power, and not in the sense of spiritual relation, then the cattle upon a thousand hills will be saved, for they belong to the Father, and Christ says: "All things that the Father hath are mine." [Jo. 17. 18.] (See also examination of John 6. 39.)

6. "*Will*" is frequently used conditionally; and so it undoubtedly is in this case: "I will draw all men unto me," i. e. if they will come. (See 1 Sam. 23. 11-13.) "*Shall come,*" is frequently used in the sense of *may come,* or *shall have the privilege of coming if they choose.* This is a common mode of speech. The father said to his two sons, "Stay here till to-morrow, and then you *shall* come to the feast, i. e. you may come. Thus we understand the text; "All that the Father giveth me *shall come* to me," i. e. may come if they are disposed; and in Revelations, we have a corresponding text: "Let him that is athirst *come,* and whosoever *will,* let him take the water of life freely." [Rev. 22. 17.]

But suppose we admit that Christ will be lifted up at the general resurrection; and that there and then he will *draw* all men unto him; and that *draw* is to be understood as compulsatory; and that *all men* means the whole human family, what will Universalists gain by the text? Just nothing at all; for they will then be drawn before the judgment seat to be punished (if they belong with the goats) with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. But says one: those that come to him, he declares,

he will in no wise cast out. True enough: but *coming* and being *drawn* or *dragged* to him are two things vastly different. He does not say: He that is forcibly *drawn* to me I will in no wise cast out. But "*he that comes;*" showing plainly that it is conditional. Whilst the Bible teaches that those who *come* to Christ will be saved; Universalism teaches that they will be saved whether they *come* or not,—unconditionally. Yes; if they will not come, no difference, only wait till the resurrection and Christ will *draw* them to him, which will answer the purpose just as well as though they had voluntarily come so far as future loss is concerned.

**23.** John 17. 2, 3. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him; and this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent.

Before Universalists can claim this text, they must prove five things.

1. That *all flesh* refers to the whole human family. This they cannot do, for *all flesh* embraces beasts as well as men. Proof: "And of every living thing of *all flesh*, two of every sort, shalt thou bring into the ark,—of *fowls* after their kind, and of *cattle* after their kind; and of every *creeping thing* of the earth after his kind." (Gen. 6. 19, 20.) Thus, if the "*all flesh*," of this text, is to have eternal life, we will have the company of *fowls*, *cattle*, and *creeping things* in heaven; for Christ has power over all flesh in this very sense: He says: "*All power* is given unto me in heaven, and in earth." (Math. 28. 18.) But if it be contended that *all flesh* is to be confined exclusively to the human species, then Universalists cannot prove that it means the thousandeth part of mankind. Proof: "And behold I, even I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy *all flesh*." (Gen. 6. 17.) Do Universalists believe that the entire race of Adam was destroyed by the flood? No. They will tell us it had reference to those only who lived at that time on the earth. Yes, and not to *all* of them in an unlimited sense, for eight persons out of the *all flesh* were saved alive in the ark.

2. They must prove that "*as many* as thou hast given him," means the *all flesh*, over which Christ had power. This cannot be done. The context is opposed to it:—"I pray not for the world; but for them which thou *hast given me*." (verse 9.) If the idea of Universalism be correct, that he is to give eternal life to all flesh; then it should read thus: As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give them eternal life: not that he should give eternal life to *as many* as thou hast given him. This phrase, *as many*, shows plainly that some were not included, and consequently that some were not given to Christ in this sense. For example, when Paul says: "*As many* as are of the works of the law, are under the curse,"

(Gal. 3. 10.) does it not incontrovertibly imply, that some were not of the works of the law? Yes; for all the Christians of that age were exceptions; and hence, "*as many* as thou hast given him," proves just as conclusively that some were not given to him in the sense intended in this text. (See examination of Math. 1. 21.)

3. They must prove that because Christ will *give* them eternal life, therefore they will be certain to possess it. This they cannot do; for we can prove that God has given men various things which they never possessed because they *would not* have them. For example, God gave to the children of Israel the land of Canaan; and yet because of their disobedience they never possessed it. Proof: "Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the land which I *had given* them." [Ezek. 20. 15.]

4. They must prove that *eternal life* means the joys of the immortal state and not the spiritual life of the Christian here in the church. This we admit of course, but still they are bound to prove it, and whenever they do this, they annihilate their doctrine; for *eternal life* is spoken of in more than twenty passages of scripture where it is suspended upon the conditions of faith and obedience. One example will suffice for the present: "*Fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life.*" (1 Tim. 6. 12.) Every time a Universalist quotes this text let him be forced to prove that *eternal life* refers to the future state, and you will have *Universalism against itself.*

5. They must prove that *all men*, universally, will know God, as they admit this to be an indispensable pre-requisite to the enjoyment of *eternal life.* This they cannot do. They quote Heb. 8. 11. "All shall know me from the least to the greatest," but this does not prove the point, as we shall show when we come to examine that text.

Let us now see what it is scripturally to know God: "Awake to righteousness and sin not, for some have not the *knowledge* of God." [1. Cor. 15. 34.] But why have they not the knowledge of God? Because, says the apostle: "He that *knoweth* God *heareth* us." (John 4. 6.) Again: "They profess that they *know* God, but in works they deny him, being abominable, disobedient, and unto every *good work reprobate.*" [Tit. 1. 16.] Once more: "Hereby we do know that we *know him, if we keep his commandments.* He that saith I *know* him, and *keepeth not his commandments*, is a *liar*, and the truth is not in him." [1 John 2 3, 4.] And finally: what will become of those that know not God? (See 2 Thess. 1. 7-9.) Now as Universalists admit that none can have eternal life only such as *know* God, here again we have *Universalism against itself*, for the apostles have positively and repeatedly taught that none can know God only those who keep his commandments; and if a Universalist should say he could know God without keeping his commandments, the apostle tells him, "he is a *liar*, and the *truth* is not *in him.*"

24. Acts. 3. 20, 21. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.

This text is considered strong ground in favor of Universalism. But we think this an exegetical misapprehension.

1. The whole force of the argument depends upon the word *restitution* or *restoration*. It cannot mean that the whole human family will be made holy and happy; for we have examined the testimony of all the prophets upon this subject, and not one of them has testified in favor of Universalism. Hence, this one argument is sufficient to convince the intelligent reader that the apostle Peter did not design to teach Universalism, for he speaks only of the "restitution of all things *which God hath spoken* by the mouth of all his holy prophets;" and as God did not speak of universal salvation by the mouth of *any* of his prophets it follows that Peter did not think of Universalism when he uttered this sentence. If it mean salvation at all, it can only prove the salvation of the *people of God*, for they are the only ones of whom the prophets have spoken as subjects of salvation.

2. Are Universalists certain that *restitution* here means salvation from sin? We will examine a few other texts, where the same word occurs in the original scriptures. "And Jesus answered and said unto them; Elias truly shall first come and *restore* all things," [Math. 17. 11.] i. e. make all things holy and happy! If John the Baptist made all things holy and happy, what was there left for Christ to do? "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying: "Lord wilt thou at this time, *restore* again the kingdom to Israel?" [Acts 1. 6.] i. e. wilt thou make the kingdom holy and happy; or save it from sin? "Then said he to the man: "Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was *restored* whole like as the other." [Math. 12. 13.] Was it saved from sin? "After that he put his hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up; and he was *restored*, and saw every man clearly." [Mark 8. 25.] The word *restore* in all these examples, is the same as in Acts 3. 21,—*apokatasasis*. Universalists contend that the apostle designed to teach a universal reconciliation; but unfortunately he made use of the wrong word: it should have been *apokatallasso*. If the text does literally mean to restore all men, it cannot mean to take all men to heaven, for all men have never been there; and to *restore* means to take a thing back to where it once was. Universalists can prove no more by it than this: that all men will be *restored*, than is, brought back again into the flesh to be *judged*. To restore the wicked would thus seem to be to bring them back to a state of *sin* to receive their final sentence.

3. Peter gives a reason in the next verse why this *restitution* will

take place. He commences it with the conjunction *for*, and we know this always brings in a reason. We shall expect now, if the apostle designed to teach Universalism in verse 21, that the reason he assigns will correspond with it. Let us hear it: "*For* Moses truly said unto the fathers: a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethern like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every *soul* which will not hear that prophet [shall be saved? No! no!] *shall be destroyed* from among the people." [Verse 22. 23.] Singular Universalism this, truly! The reason Peter gives for this universal salvation is, that some *souls* who will not give heed to God's word will be *destroyed!* But perhaps Peter betters the matter in the verses preceding this proof text. Let us see: "*Repent* ye therefore, and be *converted*, that your sins *may be blotted out.*" Peter certainly could not have been a Universalist, for had he been, he would not have taught repentance and conversion as necessary to the blotting out of sins: but would have taught them that whether they repented or not, it would make no difference in the out-come, for, at the *restitution*, let a man be never *so sinful*, and never so *impenitent*, his sin shall there and then be blotted out. This is undoubtedly pure Universalism.

4. We will now present *Universalism against itself*:—Christ came the second time, as we are informed by Universalists, at the destruction of Jerusalem. Then, of course, must have taken place the restitution, or the resurrection; for the heaven was to receive him till the *restitution* took place. *Then*, all things that the prophets had spoken were fulfilled: for the Saviour says: "These be the days of vengeance, that *all things* which are written may be *fulfilled.*" [Luke 21. 22.] *Then*, all men must have been saved; and consequently those that have since lived, are not men! And Universalists are proved to be the very scoffers of which Peter speaks, who should come in the last days: "Saying: where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep (i. e. since Jerusalem was destroyed,) all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." (2 Pet. 3. 4.) And their doctrine is the same old heresy which Paul advertised 1800 years ago which teaches "that the resurrection is past already." [2 Tim. 2. 18.] To sum up: Universalists are compelled to take one of three grounds; Either 1. To give up the coming of the Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem; or 2. To contend that the *restitution* took place at that time; or 3. To give up this text and confess that it does not prove their doctrine. Either answers our purpose. To say (which they do) that this *restitution* is still future, would be to say that the Lord did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, which would be a virtual renunciation of Universalism.

25. Acts. 11. 10. And this was done three times, and all were drawn up again into heaven.

This text is concerning the vision of the sheet, which Peter saw let down from heaven, full of "all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping thing, and fowls of the air." [Acts 10. 12.] Universalists contend that these living creatures represented the whole human family; and their being all taken up into heaven proves that the whole human family will be saved. They also claim that Peter was not converted to Universalism till he saw this vision; and that then the Saviour's words were fulfilled: "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." [Luke 22. 32.] We might let this all go for what it is worth,—nothing: but perhaps it is better to say a word or two to set the matter straight, and to show that this text has nothing to do with Universalism, and that Universalists have entirely misunderstood the design of this vision. 1. Suppose we should admit that Peter was not converted to Universalism till he saw this vision; it is a little singular that he should preach Universalism in the text just examined, [Acts 3. 21;] eight years before he believed the doctrine! And as he did not then believe in Universalism but still preached the gospel, as Universalists admit, one of two things must follow: either 1. That there are two gospels divinely authorized; or 2. That Universalism is no part of the gospel. Is it not one of the most singular things that Peter should preach tolerably good Universalism before he was converted; and that, in all his life afterward, he never uttered a syllable in its favor? Universalists themselves, with all their critical acumen, have never claimed a scratch of Peter's pen in proof of Universalism after his conversion! This being true, one of three things follows: either 1. That Peter was converted to Universalism, and saw that it was a dangerous doctrine in its tendency and influence, and therefore resolved not to preach it; or 2. That the reason why he never preached the doctrine after his conversion was because he believed in Universalism before, and was converted from it: or 3. That he never was a Universalist before nor after his conversion, and that his conversion has reference to something else.

2. But Peter's explanation of this vision should be taken in preference to that of Universalists. He explains it thus: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." [Acts 10. 34, 35.] All these animals being taken up into heaven, Peter understands to signify, that all men *may* be saved and be taken up into heaven if they choose, and not that they absolutely will. The vision was designed to show Peter that the gentiles as well as the Jews had a right to embrace the Gospel and be saved; and it proved effectual; —he was fully convinced by it that God was no respecter of persons, and that he would save (not every body unconditionally but) those

in every nation *who feared God and worked righteousness.* Had Peter been converted to Universalism and for the first time been expressing his convictions of its truth, he certainly would not have made use of the language he did if he had intended his real sentiments to become known, but would have expressed himself thus: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons' characters (so far as *heaven* is concerned), but in every nation he that feareth not God and worketh unrighteousness will be accepted of him." This is genuine Universalism: and Peter was no Universalist, or he was an exceedingly poor scholar, incompetent to convey his ideas so that one in ten thousand could understand him.

3. But as usual we have *Universalism against itself* in this argument. It is admitted necessarily that *heaven* relates to the kingdom of glory or the future life. This admission condemns the doctrine for *heaven* is proved to be conditional in a number of places. One will suffice for the present. "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your *reward in heaven.* (Math. 5. 12.) i. e. in the *kingdom of ultimate glory.* Whenever a Universalist presents this argument let him tell what *heaven* means and the theory of an unconditional *heaven* breaks down.

**26.** Rom. 5. 12, 18, 19. Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.

I have left out the parenthesis, and have quoted the whole connection upon which Universalists base their doctrine. But in order that this scripture be made to sustain Universalism, three things must be proved.

1. That "*all men*" and "*many*" signify the entire race of Adam, without exception.

2. That *justification,* (verse 18,) means deliverance from sin.

3. That *shall,* (verse 19) is to be understood in an absolute or unconditional sense; or that there is not an *if* implied, as in the promise to Abraham. (See examination of Gen. 22. 18.) At each of these points Universalism must fail.

1. "So death passed upon *all men.*" *All men* here cannot mean the whole human family because death did not pass upon Enoch and Elijah, since they were translated to heaven without seeing death. Paul says concerning the former: "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see *death.*" (Heb. 11. 5.) Here the *all men* of Universalism is *minus* two. But Paul speaks in the past tense.

"Death *passed* upon all men," not *will pass*. Hence *all men* does not necessarily mean those who now live upon the earth; for death certainly had not *passed* upon them, 1800 years before they existed! But if it must apply to the future as well as to the past, it still cannot mean a mathematical whole; for when the Lord shall come, at the resurrection, we are informed, literally, that many will remain alive upon the earth,—in all probability *millions*. What then becomes of the absolute totality of *all men* in this verse? Death will not pass upon those who remain alive when the Lord comes, for the apostle says, "We shall not all *sleep*." (1 Cor. 15. 51.) But to evade this difficulty it may be said, that the death here referred to, is to be understood in a moral sense, i. e. a death in sin, and not the literal death of the body. But thi only makes matters worse for Universalism; for all the myriads of the human race, who have lived and died in infancy; have never died this moral death. Infants are not sinners, for "sin is the transgression of the law." [1 Jo. 3. 4.] And, "Where no law is, there is no transgression." [Rom. 4. 15.] And Universalists themselves quote the language of the Saviour, to prove that infants are perfectly *pure*, *innocent* and *uncontaminated*: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." [Mark 10. 14.] These remarks will also apply to the word *many*, [verse 19.]

2. We shall now present another view of verse 18 by paraphrasing it. "Therefore by the offence of one man, which was Adam, judgment came upon all men to the condemnation of a natural death, by which means they were taken down to the grave; even so by the righteousness or obedience of one man, who was the second Adam—the Lord from heaven—the free gift came upon all men to a justification or resuscitation to life, or the resurrection from the dead." This is probably the true idea of this text. At least Universalists cannot disprove it.

3. "So by the obedience of one, *shall* many be made righteous." [Verse 19.] *Shall*, is here used conditionally; for there are many passages which teach positively, that in order to be *righteous* men must obey God. Little children, let no man deceive you. He that *doeth righteousness is righteous*, even as he is righteous." [1 John 3. 7.] "In every nation he that feareth God and *worketh righteousness* is accepted of him." [Acts 10. 35.] "Whosoever *doeth not righteousness* is not of God." [John 3. 10.] "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves *servants* to *obey*, his servants ye are to whom ye *obey*, whether of sin unto death or of *obedience unto righteousness*." (Rom. 6. 16.) Hence we understand the apostle the same as if he had said: "So by the obedience of one, *shall* many be made righteous *if* they do righteousness." None were ever made sinners by the disobedience of Adam, only those who voluntarily acted upon the principle of disobedience which Adam introduced. This being incontrovertibly true, it follows that none can be made righteous by the obe-

dience of Christ, only such as voluntarily act in conformity to the example of obedience which Christ laid down And as none were made sinners in the future state by the disobedience of Adam, therefore none will be made righteous by the obedience of Christ only in this life. If Universalists can prove that those who die unrighteous, can act upon the example of Christ in voluntary obedience and thus become righteous in a future state, I can prove by the same logic that those who die righteous may after this carry out the principle of disobedience introduced by Adam, and thus voluntarily become unrighteous! But we are not left in the dark to infer with reference to the apostle's meaning. He throws in a verse explanatory to show positively that he does not design to teach Universalism. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more *they which receive* abundance of *grace* and of the *gift* of *righteousness shall reign in life* by one Jesus Christ." [Verse 17.] This then settles the controversy upon this text. It shows that those who receive the "*gift of righteousness*" are the ones who are made righteous by the obedience of Christ, and those who "receive abundance of *grace*" are the characters who will be saved or "*reign in life* by one Jesus Christ." In order to know who will *reign in life*, we must know who will *receive grace*. Universalism says that God gives grace to everybody: but Peter says: "God resisteth the proud and *giveth grace* to the *humble*." (2 Pet. 5. 5.) None but the *humble*, therefore, can receive grace; and some are not profited by it when they do receive it, for they have it in their power to receive it in vain: proof: "We therefore as workers together with him beseech you also that ye *receive not the grace of God in vain*." (2 Cor. 6. 2.) They also have it in their power to fall from grace: proof: "Christ is become of no effect unto you whosoever of you are justified by the law ye are *fallen from grace*." (Gal. 5. 4.) They also have it in their power to lose the grace of God entirely: proof: "Follow peace with all men and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord: looking diligently lest any man *fail* of the *grace of God*." On the whole, this proof-text does not look very much like Universalism.

27. Rom. 6. 23. The wages of sin is death, but the *gift of God is eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord.

1. Universalists quote this text to prove that the life beyond the resurrection is unconditional, because it is the *gift of God*. There is not a book in favor of Universalism extant which has not this text in it thus applied. We take it for granted, therefore, that this is one of their *strong* proofs.

2. Does it follow, because eternal life is a *gift* that therefore it is unconditional? Not at all, but right the reverse as we will now show. The word *gift* presupposes a *giver*, and the word *giver* presupposes a *receiver*, and the word *receiver*, in connection with *giver*, presupposes *reception*, which to all intents and purposes is a *condition*. There can be no *gift* without a *giver*, and there can be no

*giver* without a *receiver;* neither can there be a *gift* possessed or enjoyed by the *receiver* without the condition of *reception.* Hence *eternal life* being a *gift* is the very strongest argument imaginable in favor of its conditionality. As certain as *eternal life* is a *gift* to accountable beings, just so certain must they *accept* it or never have it.—Thus testifies Paul: "Fight the good fight of faith and *lay hold* on [or accept of] eternal life." (1 Tim. 6 12.) The Saviour also expresses the same: "Search the scriptures for in them ye think ye have *eternal life,* and they are they that testify of me; but ye *will not come* unto me, that ye *might have* [*eternal*] *life.*" (John 5. 39, 40.)

3. It is said if eternal life be conditional, then it is a matter of debt and credit between man and God! It is somewhat astonishing and needs a mark of wonder or surprise, that men of intelligence should make such a mistake.

Universalists admit that the present salvation, or forgiveness of sins, is conditional, since every passage which speaks of salvation as conditional they refer to the present salvation from sin in order to keep it out of the future state. Now let us ask: Is the forgiveness of sins a matter of debt and credit between man and God? Does man remunerate God for the benefit received by simply submitting to the terms of pardon? But are we told that forgiveness is not a *gift?* Hear Peter: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to *give* repentance to Israel and *forgiveness* of sins." (Acts 5. 31.) Cannot *eternal life* depend upon the condition of obedience and still be a *gift* of God, the same as *forgiveness* of sins? But suppose a case: A beggar presents himself before your door, hungry, cold, and miserably clad. Your sympathies are excited for him. You prepare a suit of clothes, and spread your table with the bounties of providence. You invite the hungry man to come in, and partake of your hospitalities as a *free gift.* But to your astonishment the man replies: If that food which you have prepared be a *free gift,* as you say, than it is unconditional, and consequently I expect to have it without accepting it, or without coming in and eating it! And those garments: if I have to be to the trouble of putting them on, in order to enjoy them, it will be a matter of debt and credit between you and me; and why then do you talk about them as a *gift* when you require me to pay you for them by putting them on? You would be utterly astonished at such inconsistency. Yet, if you turn to the "Star in the West," a leading Universalist weekly, you will find its pages filled with just such reasoning.

4. The Saviour taught his disciples to pray: "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name:—*give* us this our daily bread." (Math 6. 9, 11.)—Yet who supposes that our daily bread is to be possessed or enjoyed independent of our complying with the laws of *Nature? In fact, there* cannot be such a thing as an unconditional

*gift:* it is a contradiction in terms, since the very word itself as we have shown, refutes such an hypothesis by always carrying along with it the idea of *reception*, as a condition to be complied with before the *gift* can be possessed or enjoyed. God even gives men certain things which they never possess, from the fact that they will not *have* or accept them. As an example of this, we refer to the fact that God gave the land of Canaan to the children of Israel and for their disobedience he never allowed them to possess it. Thus the Lord, by the mouth of the prophet says: "Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the *land which I had given them.*" (Ezek. 20. 15.) Hence, God may *give* men the antitype of this *land*,—the eternal Canaan,—the rest that remains for the people of God; and still if they will not accept, but reject the gift, they will not possess it: but, like the rebellious Israelites, will forfeit their inheritance by disobedience.

5. The phrase "*through* Jesus Christ our Lord," we claim as diametrically opposed to the Universalist assumption of Unconditionality. The meaning is precisely the same as if he had said: "The gift of God is eternal life, *in obedience to* Jesus Christ our Lord." We have some reason for this claim. When Paul says: "*Through this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," (Acts 13. 38,) does he not mean to be understood the same as if he had said: "*In obeying this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins?" Most certainly: this Universalists admit; and this being so, the whole doctrine is laid prostrate with the dust: for instead of the apostle teaching what they have always assumed, namely: that *eternal life* is unconditional because it is the gift of God, he has taught in direct opposition to it, that the gift of God is eternal life *through* or *in obedience to*, Jesus Christ our Lord;—the same as if he had said: the *gift* of God is eternal life *conditionally.*

6. The conditionality of eternal life is farther demonstrated from the preceding verse: "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end *everlasting life*," or *eternal life*, it being the same word in the Greek: *zoe aionios; life eternal:* and in this verse it is suspended upon the condition of "having our fruit unto holiness." No man dare assert that *eternal life* in verse 22, is not the same as *eternal life* in verse 23, which is the *gift of God.* The two verses are joined together in such a manner as utterly to exclude such an idea: the latter being given as a reason for what the apostle had said in the former. They are united thus: "Ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end *eternal life; for* the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is *eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" The conjunction *for*, brings in the reason why *eternal life* is suspended upon the condition of having "our fruit unto holiness:" it is *because* it is the *gift of God through*, or in *obedience* to Jesus Christ our Lord! Dare any man risk his *reputation as* a critic or a scholar by denying this exa-

gesis, or by assuming that the apostle in one verse, lays down the position that *eternal life* is conditional, and in the next verse gives his reason for it, but uses the same word in a sense differing in the latter infinitely from the former?

7. This same phrase, *eternal life*, which as Universalists acknowledge refers to the future state, is used by the apostle in another connection, where it is also unanswerably proved to be conditional. "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap *life eternal*;" (Gal. 6. 8.) *zoe aionios*, the same word used in the proof-text under examination. This cannot mean the spiritual life of the gospel which the Christian enjoys here in time; for those brethren were then in possession of that life: but this *eternal life*, which they were to reap by sowing to the spirit, was still in the future, as he declares in the next verse: "And let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we *shall reap* if we faint not." This proves that the *eternal life*, which Christains are to reap if they faint not, is the life of immortality beyond the resurrection, the same as in Rom. 6. 23. Had the apostle understood this *eternal life* as meaning no more than the present spiritual life of the Christian, he would not have placed the verb in the future tense,—"we *shall reap*;" but in the present: *We do reap* every day of our lives as we go along! From this it is certain the apostle refers to the future life; and just so certain he breaks down Universalism by making the life to come depend upon our conduct in time. Here then we see the difference between Paul and a Universalist clergyman. One teaches that: "In due season we shall reap *if we faint not*;" whilst the other teaches, that "In due season we shall reap if we faint *or* not!"

8. But we are told that it is contrary to reason to talk of sowing in one place, and reaping in another. How would it look, say the advocates of Universalism, for a man to sow in Ohio, and then go west of the Rocky mountains to reap his crop? This however is but an apparent difficulty, as we will show; but we will first return the compliment by presenting a real one, for Universalism to meet it if it can.

Who ever heard of a man *sowing* and *reaping* both as he went along?—scatter a handful of seed, and reach forth his sickle immediately and reap it before he left his tracks! This is Universalism; but it is neither reason, common sense, Nature, nor religion. But with respect to this imaginary difficulty, I pretend not to say but that men will receive the final decision of their destiny on this earth; for they are to be recompensed at the resurrection; and the resurrection must take place on the earth where the dead are buried: and thus they will reap the crop where they have sown the seed. But let this be as it may, men do not always in a moral point of view, or with respect to character, reap in the precise spot where they sow. A *man may sow the seeds of* iniquity in Europe, and before they have

time to spring up and grow he may cross the mighty deep, and in America, when time unvails his true character, he may reap the bitter fruits of his own ill doings. A man may set on foot a scheme of wickedness which may carry the seeds of wretchedness and ruin to future ages and distant climes. But enough of this: Universalists should be the last to talk about God's carrying things over from time to eternity, to be settled there; when according to their doctrine, notwithstanding men become sinners in time, yet God lets them remain so as long as they live; and instead of exerting Almighty power to make them righteous where they become wicked, he lets them die in their sins, and postpones the important matter of their conversion till the resurrection of the dead; when the whole matter, which could have been settled just as well in time, will then be disposed of!

And finally: as Universalists admit that *eternal life*, in this proof-text, refers to the future state: it follows hence, that the *death* placed in antithesis to it, must be an *eternal death*, and must also refer to the same period,—the resurrection state!

28. Rom. 8. 19–23. For the earnest expectation of the creature, waiteth for the manifestations of the sons of God; for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption to wit, the redemption of our body.

This portion of scripture is considered one of the stongest grounds of Universalism; and some have even gone so far as to say, that if this was the only text in the Bible which appeared to favor Universalism, they would nevertheless believe the doctrine. We will endeavor, however, to show them in a few minutes, that they would have but a slim foundation for their faith. This text has puzzled more commentators, perhaps, than any other. We expect, however, in the few remarks we have to offer to pursue a course marked out by none of them. Not that we wish to be singular: but we wish to express our own convictions upon the subject.

Universalists contend that the Greek word *ktisis*, here translated "*creature*," and "*creation*," signifies the whole human family. This we deny, and we proceed in the first place to disprove it. The language which the apostle makes use of, excludes the idea, that "*the whole creation*" means the entire posterity of Adam.—This is clear without an argument, if we simply look at his language. "For we know *that the whole creation* groaneth, and travaileth in

pain together until now, and *not only they*, but *ourselves also*," i. e. not only the *whole creation*, but ourselves *also;* showing most conclusively that *ourselves* was no part of this *whole creation* of which he was speaking. If this be not so then there is no meaning in language. Suppose I should say: All that were in the house heard him say it, and not only they but ourselves also: would it not follow conclusively that *ourselves* were not in the house? Would I not be considered as talking nonsense to say: All that were in the house heard him, and *not only they* but *ourselves also*, when *ourselves* were in the house just as much as any of the others referred to?

This one criticism disposes of Universalism so far as the text is concerned. Now, as this is not the meaning of the text, it remains for us to try to find out what it does mean. But previous to this, we remark, that the *creation* or *creature* cannot include Christians, or the sons of God; because the apostle says, that the "*creature* waiteth for the manifestations of the sons of God;" not for the manifestations of itself, certainly! And it "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" not into the glorious liberty of itself! And again: "Not only they [i. e. the *creation*] but ourselves *also*, who have the first fruits of the spirit." According to this: Christians, or those who have the first fruits of the spirit, are no part of this *creation* upon which the apostle is treating. And if there can be a "*whole creation*," without Christians, may there not, upon the same principle, be a *whole creation* without sinners? and thus have a *whole creation* of somebody else, who are called neither Christians nor sinners? We shall come to the point soon. But does the whole *creation* mean the physical *creation*, or the earth we inhabit? Many excellent men, and men of erudition have taken this ground: but with due deference we beg leave to dissent and will assign our reasons. The creature is here spoken of as *groaning, waiting*, and *hoping*. It is contended, however, that these expressions are applied to the earth figuratlvely. We admit that the *waiting* may be, and no doubt is used *figuratively;* but the *groaning* cannot be; and consequently the *creation* which *groans* cannot mean the earth. The word *groan* cannot be used figuratively, for this reason. The disciples are said to take part in this very *groaning*, which is applied to the *creation*. Read the text again: "For we know that the whole *creation groaneth and travaileth in pain* together until now; and not only they, but ourselves *also*, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves *groan* within ourselves, waiting for the adoption to wit, the redemption of our body." Here then we have it; that the *creation groans*, and not only they, but the disciples *also* groan. Mark that word "*also*;" for it shows that the disciples took part in the same groaning, experienced by the *creation*, which proves that it cannot be figurative, and consequently that the *creation* cannot mean the *earth. It cannot be supposed* that the apostle would tell us, that the

*creation groans*, and that the disciples *also* groan, and use the word *groan* figuratively the first time, and literally the next! This would violate all correct rules of interpretation. From this and the foregoing, we think we are justified in the following conclusions: 1. That *ktisis*, rendered *creation*, does not mean the whole human family. 2. That it does not signify Christians. 3. That it does not mean sinners. 4. That it cannot signify the physical creation, or the earth: and 5. That it does, or at least may signify the *infant creation*, or that part of the human family who never arrive at the age of accountability, and who are never in the scriptures styled either Christians or sinners. Do you say this idea is *strange?* If so, I would say, as did Paul: "Be not forgetful to *entertain strangers*, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." This view of the subject will amply harmonize with the context; whilst any other view seems irreconcilable. "The creature was made subject to vanity not willingly." That is, the *infant creation* was made subject to pain, sickness and death; not willingly,—not by their own choice or by their own *willful* disobedience, as is frequently the case with their parents, and as was the case with our first parents in Eden, who *willingly transgressed* the law of God and brought this *vanity*, this sickness and death upon their innocent offspring. Thus it was that the infant *creation* was made subject to *vanity*, by reason of *him*, i. e. Adam, who by his transgression subjected them to pain and death, but not, however, without a hope that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and that then this innocent *creation*, who have *groaned* and travailed in *pain* together until now, shall "*also*" be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the *children of God*. They shall be partakers of the same inheritance with the saints in light, and be brought to the enjoyment of the same *liberty* allotted to those who, in mature age, have voluntarily been adopted into the family of God. Universalists are kindly invited to refute this exposition if they can.

But they may say that *ktisis* cannot mean *infants*; and that it has not this meaning once in the whole Bible. But they tell us that *ktisis* means the *whole human family* without exception! Are not *infants* a *part* of the *whole human family?* Universalists are thus necessarily compelled to admit that the *creation*, as here used, means all that we contend it does; for they say it means all *that* and more too. We accept our part and challenge them to prove that it means any more! Let them put their finger upon that text of scripture where *ktisis* means the entire posterity of Adam or hold their peace in regard to our exegesis. Whenever they tell us that *ktisis* means the whole human family, we freely admit that it means that part of the human family who die in *infancy*, and deny its meaning any more.

29. Rom. 11. 25, 26. For I would not brethren that you should be ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits: that blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

Before Universalists can claim this text in support of their doctrine, three things must be proved. 1. That "*all Israel*" means the whole Jewish nation without exception. 2. That the "*fullness of the Gentiles*" means all the Gentiles who have ever lived, are now living, or ever will live. And 3. That "*shall be saved,*" is to be understood in an unconditional or absolute sense. Let them fail in any one of these points, and this text is of no avail.

1. Does "*all Israel*" mean the whole Jewish nation? "And Moses called *all Israel*, and said unto them." [Deu. 5. 1.] Did Moses call the whole Jewish nation when thousands of them had died a short time before, and when millions of them were not yet born? The following texts are all of the same category.

"And *all Israel* stoned him with stones." [Jos. 7. 25.]

"And Gideon made an ephod thereof, and put it in his city, even in Ophrah; and *all Israel* went thither." [Jud. 8. 27.]

"Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons did to *all Israel.*" [1. Sam. 2. 22.]

"Now Samuel was dead, and *all Israel* had lamented him." [1. Sam. 28. 3.]

"And *all Israel* fled every one to his tent." [2 Sam. 18. 17.]

"And *all Israel* heard of the judgment which the King had judged." [1. Ki. 3. 28.]

"And the King and *all Israel* with him, offered sacrifice before the Lord. [1. Kings 8. 62.]

"And *all Israel* shall mourn for him, and bury him. (1. Kings 14. 13.)

"And David and *all Israel* went to Jerusalem." (1. Chron. 11. 4.)

"Thus *all Israel* brought up the ark of the covenant." (1. Ch. 15. 28.)

"God smote Jeraboam, and *all Israel.*" (2 Chron. 13. 15.)

"So *all Israel* shall be saved." (Rom. 11. 26.)

In not one of these texts does *all Israel* mean the whole Jewish nation without exception: neither has it this meaning once in the Bible. In each of these examples it means all, or a majority of the Jews who lived at that particular period of time to which the text refers, and no more.

So it is with this proof-text. It refers to a certain period of time in the future: when a general conversion of the Jews, who are at that time living shall take place. Then the Deliverer, who has come *out of Zion, shall turn away* ungodliness from Jacob.

2. Does the "*fullness of the Gentiles,*" mean the whole Gentile world? Universalists cannot prove that it does from the fact that this is the only text in the Bible where this phrase occurs. *We* have however two good reasons for the contrary belief. 1. That *all Israel* (which is put in contrast with the *fullness of the Gentiles,*) as we have proved, does not mean a totality; and consequently that the other does not. 2. Because we have a phrase parallel with this, which does not include a mathematical whole. "But when the *fullness* of the *time* was come, God sent forth his son." (Gal. 4. 4.) It cannot mean when *all time* had come; for there have been more than 1800 years since! Therefore the *fullness of the Gentiles* cannot mean *all the Gentiles* without exception.

3. In the phrase *shall be saved,* there is an *if* implied and to be understood, because it is expressed in another place in this same chapter (verse 23,), and hence it is not an absolute or unconditional promise, but the same as in the promise to Abraham. "And they also," says Paul, "*if* they abide not in unbelief, *shall* be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again—*so* all Israel shall be saved." How? Ans. "*If* they abide not in unbelief."

4. *Universalism is against itself* by admitting that *saved* here refers to the future state of existence. Let us now see whether Paul believed that all the Jews and Gentiles would be saved independently of faith and obedience. "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be *saved.*" [Romans 10. 1.] Why, Paul, you are a Universalist! and to desire, and pray, and labor that Israel might be *saved* when you knew that they were just as sure of salvation without, seems strange! Again says this Universalist: "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means *save some.*" [1. Cor. 9. 22.] What! laboring to *save some* when all are certain to be saved? Truly, this is strange Universalism. But, finally, says our Universalian apostle: "And being made perfect he [Christ] became the author of *eternal salvation,* to all them that *obey him.*" [Heb. 5. 9.] Worse, and more of it! But once more: "Wherefore he is able also to *save* them to the uttermost *that come unto God by him.* [Heb. 7. 25.] No one needs to be told that Universalism is the exact opposite of all this plain teaching of the great apostle to the Gentiles. Instead of Christ having become "the author of *eternal salvation* to all them that *obey* him," the doctrine distinctly proclaims that Christ is the author of *eternal salvation* to all men whether they *obey* him or not! This is not a misrepresentation, for the advocates of this faith have themselves defined *saved* and *salvation* as referring to the future state by quoting and so applying this proof-text. They will learn, before they get through with this analysis, that the Bible is not a nose of wax, so to speak, and that they have not the special lisence to refer *words* to a future state and give them a universal application whenever the text seems to favor their doctrine, and then limit the same words to this life for no reason

save that with a future application they would break down their theory! No stronger *phrase*, nor one more certainly referring to a future state, can be found in scripture than "*eternal salvation*," which is here positively made conditional.

**30.** Rom. 11. 36. For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

1. This is called the grand *finale* of Universalism. But it cannot prove the doctrine; for the same *all things* that are *to him*, are also *of him:* and if *to him* means *salvation*, then all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, creeping things, and fish of the sea, will surely get to heaven; for they are *all* "*of him.*" This is enough to set this text aside, as far as it is claimed in support of Universalism. But,

2. The *Pro and Con of Universalism* by Pingree, asserts that God is the author of sin, and quotes this very text to prove it! (page 81.) Now if these *all things* that are *of* God are *to* him, and if *to him* means *salvation*, and if the *Pro and Con* is right, then *sin*, as well as the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms, will be saved in heaven with an everlasting salvation! What an *'ism* this is, when fully analyzed!

3. But *Universalism is against itself* also, in its application of this text. We are told that all men originally came from God, and all will again in the same sense return *to* him at the resurrection. This being true, there will be no such thing as the salvation of men in heaven at all; for there will be no such beings as men in existence! —Before men were *of* God, they did not exist in any individual or personal sense whatever; and consequently after they are *to* him, they will not exist as individuals, but be what they were before they were of him: viz: a part of God. Hence Universalists instead of teaching the endless salvation and happiness of men, hold to nothing but man's personal extinction and the endless salvation and happiness of God! A man once argued with the writer, that as woman was taken originally from the side of man, she would again return at the resurrection, and form a component part of man! Thus he proved that there would be no women in heaven. This is Universalism gone to seed.

**31.** 1 Cor. 11. 3. But I would have you know, that the head of *every man* is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.

1. From this text Universalists infer, that Christ is the *head* of the whole human family, and consequently as all are members of his body, all therefore will be saved; for "He is the Saviour of the body." *[Eph. 5. 23.]* But this, like most of their other arguments, is built

upon assumption. They assume that "*every man*," here means *all mankind* totally. But are not women a part of the human family? Certainly. Well they are not included in the phrase "*every man*," as used here by the apostle; for they are spoken of in contradistinction to men. "The head of *every man* is Christ; and the head of the *woman* is the *man*." Are not *women* and *men* in this text spoken of separately and distinctly? and does it not follow that *every man* comes far short, in this case, of embracing the whole human race?

2. But Paul explains this in another place: "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." [Eph. 5. 23.] Thus, Christ being the head of *every man*, relates to every man in the church, and not every man in the world. The reason why Universalists commit such blunders in applying the word, is because they seem to pay no regard to who is speaking, who he is speaking *to*, or what he is speaking *of*. Paul was writing to the church, not to the world. Again we read: "Then the disciples, *every man* according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judea." [Acts 11. 29.] Did the whole human family, without exception, send relief up to the poor brethren in Judea? If so, who were these poor brethren? Were they not a part of the whole human family?

3. But I had nearly forgotten: Universalists tell us that the church of Christ is universal, and that all men are members of his body. Then, according to this, there is no distinction between the church and the world; for the *whole world* is the *church*. Let us try a few passages, and see how this definition will work: "And the Lord added to the *world* [which of course means the same as the *church*] daily such as should be saved." [Acts 2. 47.] The following texts will speak for themselves:

"On this rock I will build my *world*, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." [Math. 16. 18.]

"And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the *world;* but if he neglect to hear the *world*, let him be unto thee as a heathen man, and a publican." [Math 18. 17.]

"And the young men came in and found her dead, and carried her forth and buried her by her husband, and great fear came upon all the *world*, and upon as *many* as heard these things." [Acts 5. 11.] This is like "all the world and the rest of mankind!"

"And when they had ordained them elders in every *world*, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had *believed*." [Acts 14. 23.]

"Likewise greet the *world* that is in their house."—(Rom. 16. 5.)

"Therefore as the *world* is subject unto Christ, *so* let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing."—(Eph. 5. 24.)

"Let your women keep silence in the *world*,—for it is a shame for women to *speak in the world*." (1 Cor. 14. 34, 35.)

"As for Saul he made havock of the *world*, entering into every house." (Acts 8. 3.)

"Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the *world*, which was in Jerusalem." (Acts 11. 22.)

"From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the *world*." (Acts 20. 17.) But enough of this.

Thus we discover that the *church* and the *world* do not quite mean the same thing.

4. Universalists are frequently heard to say, that there is not a member of their church in any penitentiary or state's prison in the United States. Not disputing their sincerity, we will now prove that every cut-throat in the penitentiary, and every scoundrel out of it that ought to be there, are members of the Universalist church in a strict sense. They themselves virtually contend for the very thing they deny. They will not dispute but that their church is the church of Christ, and they claim at the same time, that the church of Christ is universal,—that all mankind are members of Christ's body. From this it follows that all the ungodly and profane, that all liars, thieves, drunkards, manstealers, murderers; those that are abominable, disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate, are members of their church, and as these are the characters who fill our state's prisons we have clearly proved our proposition. It is an old maxim and a true one, that actions speak louder than words. This being so, let us ask: Who is the most consistent Universalist, and who evinces most faith in his doctrine; he who walks uprightly and leads a pious and Christian life, or he who acts just as though he believed he would be saved let him do what he would? Every sincere person, one would think, must come to the conclusion, that the man who would lie, steal, swear, get drunk, and disobey God in every thing, acts just as though he believed in Universalism; that is, just as though he believed that his wicked actions could not in the least endanger his eternal welfare. Such a man we call a consistent, practical Universalist, though he may not take the name nor belong to any organized society. He lives up to one command of scripture and that's all. He shows his faith by his works! But the man who would preach that the wicked would be saved just as certain as fate, and yet would not live a wicked life, I would be inclined to set him down as a hypocritical professor: that he did not believe the doctrine he preaches, or he would show his faith by his works. Suppose, reader, that we were confirmed in the belief that the wicked would be just as sure of heaven as the righteous; how could we make you believe that we were sincere in professing to believe this doctrine? Could we make you believe it by being very careful never to commit a sin or break any of God's commands? No; this would produce directly the opposite result. We could only make you believe that we believed what we professed, by showing our faith by our works,—by *trying the experiment of living* a wicked life; and thus confirming

our words by our actions that the wicked were infallibly certain of eternal life. The great distinguishing characteristic of Universalism, or that tenet which distinguishes it from all other doctrines is, that all the *ungodly* will be saved. This they may deny and say that the grand peculiarity of their system is, that *all men* will be saved. This however is not correct, for we agree in part with this; i. e. we believe that the righteous or obedient part of *all men* will be saved. Hence, the difference is not with respect to the salvation of the godly, for all parties agree upon this: it is only with regard to the salvation of the *ungodly* that we disagree. It follows therefore, that the grand feature which marks out the line of discrimination between the Universalists and the orthodox in point of doctrine, is this: They believe that all the abominable characters that disgrace the earth will be saved whether they repent in this life or not, while their opponents deny it. This, then, is the exact difference, and hence we must contend that, in order to make people believe they are sincere who profess to believe this doctrine, they must give us an experiment of an ungodly life and then we can believe they are honest. If we professed to believe that the wicked would be eternally lost, and at the same time should lead a wicked life, you would justly accuse us of hypocrisy. Consistent Universalism, therefore, is persistent wickedness.

**32.** 1 Cor. 15. 22. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

1. This text is relied upon by Universalists with the greatest assurance, as positive proof in favor of their doctrine. It has been reiterated in books and periodicals, enough to wear it out, yet it never can be made to prove Universalism. If we were going to select any one chapter with which to overturn Universalism, it would be this very 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians. As regards the correctness of our judgment, the reader can judge when he hears what we have to say.

2. The verse at the head of this article is rendered by Dr. Macknight thus: "For as *by* Adam all die, even so *by* Christ shall all be made alive." This is proved to be its correct rendering from the verse just preceding it. "For since *by* man came death, *by* man came also the resurrection of the dead: *For* as *by* Adam all die, (or go down to the grave,) even so *by* Christ, shall all be made alive," (or, be raised from the dead.) All the Universalism there is about this text, is simply this: that there shall be a *universal* resurrection of all that have died. This however proves the salvation of none, much less all. It simply states the fact: that those who have died *by* Adam shall be made alive *by* Christ: and what is to be done with them after they are thus made alive, the context and other portions of the Bible must decide.

3. This text is of itself a refutation of Universalism. "As by Adam all die, *even so by Christ* shall all be made alive." Just as they go

down to the grave by Adam, "*even so*,"—with the same moral character, shall they be made alive by Christ. If they die in their sins, unsanctified and unholy, "*even so*" shall they be made alive. If they die unjust, "*even so*" they shall be made alive; for "there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the *unjust*," [Acts 24. 15,] and then will be brought to pass the saying that is written: "He that is *unjust*, let him be *unjust* still." [Rev. 22. 11.] If they "die in the Lord," justified, pure, and holy; "*even so*," they shall be made alive.

4. This view of the subject is proved to be correct, from the following verse: "As *by* Adam all die, *even so by* Christ shall all be made alive; *but* every man in his own *order*, Christ the first fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's* at his *coming*." Here then we find there is to be two *orders* in the resurrection; one *order* for those that are *Christ's*, and the other for those that are not his. This harmonizes with the "resurrection of the *just* and of the *unjust*," precisely *two orders!* And with the language of the Saviour: "They that have done good [shall come forth] to the resurrection of *life*, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of *damnation*:"—*two orders*! (John 5. 29.) And with the prophesy of Daniel: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to *everlasting life*, and some to *shame and everlasting contempt*:" *two orders!* (Dan. 12. 2.) And also with Paul to the Thessalonians: "The dead in Christ shall rise *first*:" this implies a *second*, and here again we have the same two orders!

5. Universalists explain these different *orders* thus: "There is one *glory* of the sun, and another *glory* of the moon, and another *glory* of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in *glory*: so also is the resurrection of the dead." (Verses 41. 42.) They contend that they will all have *glory* like the stars; but some, not so much as others. Suppose we should admit all this: Universalism would lose much, and gain nothing; for Jude tells us of some "*stars* to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." (Jude 13.) But it may be asked, how can this agree with Paul, that every *star* possesses *glory*? Perfectly. Paul tells of some men, who were "the enemies of the cross of Christ,"—whose *glory* is in their *shame*,"—and "whose end is *destruction*."

6. Some Universalists contend that this resurrection signifies a moral change, or the conversion of the soul; and as all are to be made alive by Christ, or raised from the dead; therefore all will be converted to Christ! If Paul is speaking of the resurrection of the soul to a state of holiness in this chapter, then it will make good sense if we read it in this way: "But some man will say: how are the *dead* [*souls*] raised up, and with what body do the *dead* [*souls*] come? So also is the resurrection of the *dead* [soul;] it is sown in *corruption*, it is raised in *incorruption*, it is sown a natural *body* (!) it *is raised a spiritual body*," "For the trumpet shall sound, and the

dead [souls] shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this *corruptible* [soul] must put on *incorruption*; and this *mortal* [soul] must put on *immortality*: so when this *corruptible* [soul] shall have put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal* [soul] shall have put on *immortality*, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory."—[Verses 35, 42, 44, 52, 53, 54.] Can Universalists accept this? Perhaps they can; for some of them believe that the soul dies. But one step farther: Paul declares Christ to be "the *first fruits*" of this resurrection: and if this resurrection means conversion, then Christ is the first *convert to Christianity!*

7. It is known to all that Universalists generally deny the resurrection of the body; and the reason they assign, is that the body dies and decomposes, and is incorporated in other bodies; and hence they infer the impossibility of its resurrection. Still they believe in the resurrection of the *dead;* and as they do not believe in the resurrection of the *dead body*, it follows that they believe in the resurrection of the *dead soul*, which proves that the soul dies. And since the soul *dies* as well as the body, it must also be *corruptible* and *material*, and consequently will decompose and be incorporated into other souls; and hence its resurrection is just as impossible as that of the body! Thus we have Universalism denying the resurrection altogether, and proving themselves to be that very sect of Sadducees condemned by the Saviour, and those very heretics advertised by Paul 1800 years ago, who teach that the resurrection is passed already, and thereby overthrow the faith of some!

8. But to return. "Christ the first fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's* at his coming." Universalists tell us that all are Christ's, and consequently all will be saved. But the phrase "*they that are Christ's*" shows plainly that some *are not his.* It so happens, that we have this precise *phrase* in another place, which proves to a demonstration that all are not Christ's. "And *they that are Christ's*, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." [Gal 5. 24.] Do those who die in their sins crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts? When Paul says "*they which are of faith*, the same are the children of Abraham," [Gal. 3. 7,] does it not imply that some have not faith? Yes; for Paul does say: "All men *have not faith.*" [2 Thess. 3. 2.] But we have the most unequivocal testimony that all are not Christ's. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ *he is none of his!*" [Rom. 8. 9.] But who have not the spirit? "If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even *the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive.*" [John 14. 15–17.] Who can receive it? "And we are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Spirit whom God hath given to *them that obey him.*" [Acts 5. 32.] And Jude says: "These be they *who* separate themselves, sensual having not the

*Spirit.*" [Jude 19.] This then settles the question as to who are Christ's and who are not. Those who obey him have the Spirit, and such are Christ's; whilst those who are *sensual* have not the Spirit and are not Christ's; and consequently will have no part with Christ at his *coming*. Universalists admit that this *coming* of the Lord is yet future and relates to the resurrection. This proves, not only that there will be a distinction at the resurrection between those that are Christ's and those that are not his; but also that the *coming of the Lord* did not take place at the *destruction of Jerusalem* as Universalists always contend to avoid the general judgment of Math. 25.

9. After the 23d verse, Paul speaks exclusively of the resurrection of the saints, or the dead in Christ, and not at all of those who die in their sins. This I will now prove. He does not intimate that the "*all*" in verse 22, are to be raised to *incorruption, glory, honor, immortality, power* and *victory*, and possess the *spiritual body*, and the *image of the heavenly*. He does not intimate such a thing; but after he brings in the two *orders*, he drops the *order* of the wicked, and takes up the *order* of those who have "fallen asleep in Christ," [verse 18,] and continues that *order* exclusively to the close of the chapter. We risk the whole controversy upon this point; and just as certain as we sustain our position, Universalism breaks down. Now who *is* it that is to be raised to incorruption, glory, immortality, etc? "As *we* have borne the image of the earthy, *we* shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say *brethern*." Ah! it is *brethern*, Paul is addressing; and now we understand what he means by the pronoun "*we:*" It personates *brethern, Christians* or the *saints* of all ages, and of every clime. Why did not Paul express himself as he did in verse 22? "As all have borne the image of the earthy, *even so all* shall bear the image of the heavenly." Paul uses the word *we*, when the word *all* will not suit, unless he should say "*we all*," meaning all Christians. The word *we* occurs in verse 19. "If in this life only *we* have hope in Christ." Have all men hope in Christ? Certainly not: none but Christians, and thus the apostle employs the word *we* throughout this chapter.

Then he proceeds: "Behold I show *you* a mystery: *we* shall not all sleep, but *we* shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we* shall be changed." After this the song of triumph is sung: "O death where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory?" The apostle answers: "Thanks be unto God which giveth *us* the *victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ*," (i. e. in *obedience to* our Lord Jesus Christ. See examination of Rom. 6. 23.) "*Therefore*," adds the apostle,(i. e. from the fact, that you are to obtain this ultimate, and triumphant victory by *obeying* Jesus Christ our Lord,") "*Therefore* my beloved brethern, *be ye steadfast, immovable*, always abounding in the *work of the Lord*, for as much as *you know [from what I* have just told you about getting the victory

through obedience,] that your *labor is not in vain in the Lord.*" Their *labor*, with respect to this victory would certainly have been in vain, had the wicked been just as sure of it as the righteous! Universalists, in order to evade the force of this argument, must prove that the word *we*, necessarily, and always means the whole human family. This they assert with reference to this chapter. We will now admit it, for the sake of argument, and see where it places Universalism: "For *we must all appear* before the *judgment seat* of Christ." [2 Cor. 5. 10.] i. e. the entire posterity of Adam *must appear* (in the *future*) before the judgment seat of Christ, which cannot possibly be till after the resurrection; for when the apostle penned that sentence millions upon millions of the human race were already dead.

10. We now present a second argument in favor of the position that Paul is speaking only of the resurrection of the just, and this we do by proving positively that the "glory," "honor," "immortality," "incorruptibility," "power," "victory," "the spiritual body," and "the image of the heavenly," to which *these* dead here spoken of are to be raised, are all conditional, and depend upon the righteous conduct of men in this life. If this is so, it will follow unavoidably, that the wicked, who die in their sins, will not enjoy the unspeakable blessings described in the foregoing language; and consequently that they are not among the number who are to be thus *raised*. Let us see. "To them who by *patient continuance in well doing* seek for *glory*, and *honor*, and *immortality*, eternal life." [Rom. 2. 7.] Here three of the list disappear! *Glory, honor* and *immortality* are conditional, hence, depend upon a patient continuance in *well doing*. But how about *incorruptibility*? "Every man that striveth for the mastery, is temperate in all things; now they do it to *obtain* a corruptible crown, but we an *incorruptible*." "So *run that you may obtain*." [1 Cor. 9. 24, 25.] Thus the *crown of incorruptibility* is to be obtained by *running*, and *striving lawfully*. The next in order is "*power*." Is this conditional? Paul is most satisfactory upon this point in relating his own experience. "Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ,—that I may know him, and the *power* of his resurrection." [Ph. 3. 8, 10.] The *power* of Christ's resurrection is the same *glorious power* which the saints are to experience, when they are "raised in power," and their "vile bodies are changed, and fashioned like unto Christ's *glorious* body;" which is, as Paul defines it: "the *power* of an *endless life;*" [Heb. 7. 16.] and is conditional, as declared in the text above quoted: Whilst the wicked are to be eternally banished "from the *glory* of his *power*." [2 Thess. 1. 9.] The "*victory*" which the subjects of *this resurrection* are to obtain, we have already examined, and have shown to be conditional, *from the fact* that it is to be obtained through Jesus Christ,

which is the same as *in obedience to Jesus Christ.* We come next to the "*spiritual body,*" which signifies a *body quickened* by the *Spirit.* Is this conditional? Let this same apostle answer: "But *if* the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also *quicken* your *mortal bodies* by his *Spirit* that dwelleth in you." [Rom. 8. 11.] Thus the *spiritual body;* or *quickening* of our *mortal bodies* by the *Spirit,* is proved to be conditional, and depends upon letting the *Spirit* of Christ dwell in us here; for, "if any man have not the *Spirit* of *Christ* he is none of his," and you recollect the apostle says: "Christ the first fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's* at his coming." [Verse 23.]

And in the last place we ask: does the "*image of the heavenly*" depend upon conditions to be performed in this life? This is the pivot upon which the whole matter now turns. We shall see. "If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; *if so be* that we *suffer with him,* that we may be also *glorified together.*" What is this being *glorified with Christ?* Paul answers: "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall *change our vile body,* that it may be *fashioned like unto his glorious body.*" [Phil. 3. 21.] Thus we will be *glorified together,* or bear the *image* of the *heavenly, if* we suffer with him. Mark that *if:* for it proves to a certainty that those who will not suffer with him,—who will not take up their cross and follow him, will not be *glorified* with him; and hence, will not bear his *image.*

Now, as Universalists admit that these eight phrases just examined, all refer to eternity,—to the resurrection state; and since we have proved, from plain scripture testimony, that they are all conditional; it is equivalent to eight-fold *Universalism against itself.*

11. We now present our third argument in proof of the position, that when Paul speaks of the resurrection to a state of *immortality* and *glory,* he has reference only to the *saints.* We do this by proving, that in 1 Thess. 4th, Paul treats upon the same subject, and refers to the same time precisely, that he does in 1 Cor. 15th. This proved, and our position defies the cavils of Universalism and its advocates. We will now compare these two chapters, and then leave it to the candid to judge whether they do or do not relate to the same subject and the same time. In 1 Cor. Paul speaks of some who had seen Christ, as having "fallen *asleep;*" [verse 6] by which he means a natural death of course. This all admit. In 1 Thess. he uses the word *sleep* in the same sense: "I would not have you to be ignorant brethren concerning them which are *asleep,* that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope." (Verse 13.) The two chapters agree exactly thus far, in the application of the word *sleep:* meaning thereby the death of the body in both cases. Again. In 1 Cor. 15th, he speaks of some being "*asleep in Christ;*" (verse 18.) meaning also the death *of the body, as Universalists* admit. In 1 Thess. he makes use of the

same phrase, with the same signification. "*For* if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also which *sleep in Jesus*, will God bring with him." (Verse 14.) Mark the word "*for*," at the commencement of this verse. It brings in the *reason* why they should not sorrow (as he had just told them) "concerning them which are *asleep*," (i. e. dead) because they "which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him." This therefore has the same meaning,—the death of the body;—here again the two chapters agree. In 1 Cor. he speaks of the coming of the Lord at the time of this resurrection; (verse 23.) and in 1 Thess. he speaks of the same thing: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, and the voice of the archangel." (Verse 16.) In 1 Cor. he speaks of the "sound of the *trump*," (verse 52,) at the time of this resurrection. In 1 Thess. he speaks of the same thing,—the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*." (Verse 16.) In 1 Cor. he speaks of some who shall be alive at the time the Lord shall come to raise the dead,—"Behold I show you a mystery: *we shall not all sleep*." (Verse 51.) And in 1 Thess. he speaks of the same thing: "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that *we which are alive*, and *remain* unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them that are *asleep*." (Verse 15.) In 1 Cor. he speaks of a certain class being raised to a state of *glory*, *honor* and *immortality*, when the Lord shall come. He expresses it thus: "Christ the first fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's at his coming*." (Verse 23.) This tells who are to have part in this *glorious* resurrection when the Lord comes. It is "*they that are Christ's*." Every unprejudiced mind must admit, we think, that the phrase "*they that are Christ's*" has the same meaning as "*they which are fallen asleep in Christ*;" which the apostle makes use of just before. But as 1 Thess. has so far exactly agreed in every particular with 1 Cor. proving indisputably that they both relate to the same event, and are both to be understood literally; we shall therefore let 1 Thess. explain who the apostle has reference to, when he says: "*they that are Christ's*," who are to be raised when the Lord comes, at the sound of the "*last trump*." The cause of Universalism now hangs upon this single point: Does "*they that are Christ's*," who are to be raised when the Lord comes, mean all mankind? "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*, and the ☞ *dead in Christ shall rise first*." (Verse 16.) "*They that are Christ's at his coming*." How exactly they coincide! "*They that are Christ's*," is hereby proved positively to mean those "*that sleep in Jesus*," and not those who sleep in their sins; and just so certain, those spoken of in 1 Cor. 15, who are to be raised to *glory* and possess a *spiritual body*, and the *image of Christ*, are saints and not sinners. From all this, we have two other texts put beyond the reach of quibble. "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me write: blessed are the dead *that die in the Lord*;" (Rev. 14. 13.) and they are not only blessed from the fact

that they "rest from their labors and their works do follow them;" [ibid.] but also, as we have seen, from the fact that "*the dead in Christ shall rise first.*" From this, Universalists are compelled to admit "the *first resurrection*" to be as literal as that in 1 Cor. 15th. This they cannot avoid. With this admission before us we read: "*Blessed* and *holy* is he that *hath part in the first resurrection;* on such the *second death* hath no power." [Rev. 20. 6.] We prove four things by this text, either of which refutes Universalism: 1. That those who do not have part in the first resurrection, will not be *blessed:* 2. That they will not be *holy;* so they will be neither *holy* nor *happy.* 3. That on such the *second death will have power;* and 4. That the *second death* is beyond the *resurrection!*

12. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (1 Cor. 15. 26.) This, we are told, proves that *all the enemies of man* shall be destroyed. But we say it proves no such thing. Yet we admit that it does, for the sake of the argument; and let Universalists see what they can do about it. Death is not the enemy of man, according to Universalism; for the more men die, the more get to heaven as all go there! But who are the enemies of man?

1. All wicked men are enemies to righteous men; for Christ says: "Love your enemies." Hence all the wicked will be destroyed at the resurrection for, mark it: they are the *enemies of men!*

2. All righteous men are enemies to wicked men; (Gal. 4. 16.) therefore all the *righteous* will be destroyed at the resurrection; and hence nobody will be saved, neither good, bad, nor indifferent!

3. God is the enemy of man. Proof: "But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit, therefore he was turned to be their *enemy.*" (Is., 63. 10.) When Samuel came up out of his grave, he addressed Saul: "Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee and has become thine *enemy?*" (1 Sam. 28. 16.) The Lord spake unto the Jews: "But if thou shalt indeed obey his [the angel's] voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an *enemy* unto thine *enemies.*" [Ex. 23. 22.] Hence, as all the *enemies* of man, according to the positive teaching of Universalism, are to be destroyed, it follows that after the resurrection there will be *no God!*

13. But these enemies that are to be destroyed are enemies of Christ. Proof: "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," [Heb. 1. 13.] is the language of God to his Son. Who are these enemies? Paul will answer. "Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the *enemies of the cross of Christ,* whose end is *destruction.*" [Phil. 3. 18, 19.] Not only wicked men are enemies and will be destroyed. but also the *grave, death* and the *devil.* But Universalists tell us that the wicked will be destroyed *as* wicked, yet they themselves will be saved. Then, on the same principle, death will be destroyed *as* death: yet death *itself* will be taken to heaven! The grave will *be* destroyed *as* such; yet the grave itself will be taken to heaven!

*Sin* and the *devil* will be destroyed *as* such; yet *sin* and the *devil* will be saved in heaven with an everlasting *salvation!* What a *heaven* Universalists would make, if they could only have their own way about it! But ask a Universalist what he means by *death* and the *devil* being *destroyed*, and he will tell you at once: that they will no longer exist,—that they will be annihilated totally. Very good! Then as wicked men are to be destroyed, they will consequently be sent out of existence, or totally *annihilated!* Hence Universalists, on their own principles, are compelled to turn *annihilationists*, and in this way renounce Universalism.

14. But Universalists quote: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifest, that he might destroy the works of the devil." [1 John 3. 8.] This is true: but we will now show that wicked men are the works of the devil, and therefore *they* will also be destroyed. "Ye are of your father the devil," says Christ; hence the devil is the spiritual father of the wicked, and they are his spiritual children. Paul ays to the Corinthian brethern: "I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved *sons*, I warn you." [1 Cor. 4. 14.] Thus: these brethren were Paul's spiritual children. But what else does Paul tell them? "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye *my work*, in the Lord?" (1 Cor. 9. 1.) Thus, the fact that they were Paul's spiritual *children* proved that they were his *work;* hence the fact that the wicked are the children of the devil proves conclusively that they are the *works* of the *devil*, and when Universalists quote scripture to prove that the *works* of the devil shall be destroyed, it is but another argument against their own position.

33. Eph. 1. 9–11. Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath proposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth: even in him, in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.

1. God made known the mystery of his *will*, that many things *might* be done, which are *not* done. We will now prove this proposition: that whatever has been said or done on the part of God, that he *might* accomplish a certain object: if that object embraces the happiness of men, it depends chiefly upon the actions of men for its accomplishment. One quotation will suffice: "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he *might* redeem us from *all iniquity* and *purify* unto himself a peculiar people, *zealous of good works.*" (Ti. 2. 14.) Does it depend upon the actions of men, to be *redeemed from all iniquity* and to become a peculiar people

*zealous of good works?* Certainly. Why are not all men redeemed from *all iniquity?* and why are not all men *purified* unto Christ a peculiar people *zealous of good works*, since Christ gave himself that he *might* thus purify and redeem them? Let Universalism answer this, and it can then explain how it is that God could make known his will, that he *might* gather all men into Christ, and yet that *gathering* not be accomplished.

2. When was this gathering into Christ to be brought about? The text itself settles this: "That in the *dispensation of the fullness of times* he might gather together," &c. The *fullness of time* was at the first coming of Christ; (Gal. 4. 4.) and that *fullness of time*, has a *dispensation;* and that dispensation is the Christian dispensation,—the *dispensation of the fullness of times* in which he has made known his will, that he *might* gather men into Christ: and this *will*, which God has made known, teaches, that in order to come into Christ, and thus to be gathered together *in one*, we must put him on by obedience; (Gal. 3. 27.) and Paul declares that he had labored and preached, according to this will, that he might "*present every man*, perfect *in Christ Jesus.*" (Col. 1. 28.) Now since Universalists admit that this gathering men into Christ, according to the *will* which God has made known, is absolutely essential to their future and eternal salvation; and since this gathering is to be accomplished here in *time;* and since the apostles labored *according to this will*, to bring men into Christ; and since we have it positively declared in this *will*, that a man, in order to be *in Christ* must voluntarily put him on by submitting to the gospel: it follows therefore incontrovertibly, that we have *Universalism against itself* every time this text is forced into its service.

3. Neither does the fact that God "worketh all things after the counsel of his own *will*," help the cause of Universalism. His will, as we have seen, is the New Testament. This is the will which he has "made known," and he works all things according to it. Hence if any man is *worked* from a *sinner* to a *saint*,—from *sin* to *holiness*, or from *earth* to *heaven*, it must be according to the New Testament, or not at all; for he *works* all things according to the counsel of his own *will*. From this it follows that God will not *work* a *sinner* into a *Christian*, and wash him from the stains of guilt, by any physical operation at the resurrection (as we have seen in the article preceding this), for this is not according to the New Testament plan. Neither will God *work* a man over from moral putrefaction, by the mysterious and *unrevealed* fires of purgatory, into the image of purity; for upon this, the New Testament is likewise silent. Hence if God takes men to heaven according to his *will* (which must be the case if they are taken there at all), it can only be done by their obeying the precepts which that *will* has laid down.

4. Universalists need not tell us, as they sometimes do, that be*cause God works* "*all things;*" he will therefore work *universal salva-*

*tion.* This kind of logic might prove too much, as it might prove the damnation of the wicked!

**34.** Phil. 2. 9–11. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

Universalists argue from this text, that the entire human race will confess Christ to the glory of God the Father, and hence all will be saved. If the premises were correct, we should not object to the conclusion: but as the premises are false, the conclusion must also be, if logically deduced.

The text does not read (as Universalists generally quote it), every knee *shall* bow, and every tongue *shall* confess: but every knee *should* bow, and every tongue *should* confess: and we know that men *should* do a great many things they will not do. Men *should* love their wives: yet some men do not. Men *should* be honest, yet some men cheat and steal. Men *should* love and respect their neighbors, yet they sometimes murder them. The scriptures however are satisfactory upon this point. Paul says: "We *should* live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world." [Tit. 2. 12.] Do all men live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world? The following texts will speak for themselves, and show that men *should* do some things which they do just as they please about, and consequently the fact that they *should* do them, is no proof that they will do them.

"We also *should* walk in the newness of life." [Rom. 6. 4.]

"Henceforth we *should not* serve sin." [Ibid. 6.]

"We *should* serve in newness of spirit." [Rom. 7. 6.]

"They which live, *should not* henceforth live unto themselves; but unto him which died for them, and rose again." [2 Cor. 5. 15.]

"And they went out and preached that men *should* repent." [Mark 6. 12.]

"Cause me to know the way wherein I *should* walk." [Ps. 143. 8.]

"Teach them the good way wherein they *should* walk." [1 Kings 8. 36.]

We shall now present an exact parallel with this proof-text. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men *should* honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." [John 5. 23.]

Christ being exalted that *every tongue should* confess, is parallel with his having all judgment given to him, that *all men should* honor him, yet who would be willing to contend that all men do honor the Son even as they honor the Father. How about the Jews? Now the *very reason Universalists* will assign why all men do not honor

the Son, we will assign why every tongue will not confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. But it may be said: God has *foreordained* that every tongue should confess, and therefore it must be done. But God has foreordained that certain things *should* be done, which are, or are not done, just as men feel disposed. For instance: Paul speaking of good works, says: "God *hath before ordained* that we *should* walk in them." [Eph. 2. 10.] Yet we frequently do not walk in these good works, as God has *ordained* we *should*. Hence, as this *bowing* and *confessing* is proved to be voluntary obedience to be performed in this life; and since Universalists admit it to be essential to admission into heaven: it follows that man's future destiny depends upon his conduct here, which is another case of *Universalism against itself*. Whatever Christ was exalted the first time to accomplish, will be done in this life, if done at all. Proof: "Him hath God *exalted* with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give *repentance* to Israel and the *forgiveness of sins*." [Acts 5. 31.] Did the apostles, in all their preaching, ever intimate that *repentance* and *remission of sins* belonged to the future state of existence? Certainly not. Hence as it is on account of this first *exaltation*, that every knee *should* bow, and every tongue *should* confess, it must be evident therefore that *this* likewise is confined to the present state of existence. *Here*, in this life, it is, that "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." [Rom. 10. 10.] Thus says the Saviour: "Whosoever therefore shall *confess me before men*, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." [Math. 10. 32.] Yet many will not confess him, as we read: "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not *confess* him, lest they should be put out of the Synagogue." [John 12. 42.]

But the context is against Universalism, and therefore the text itself cannot favor it; for the text and the context must agree: "Wherefore" (i. e. from the consideration that every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess, which Universalists acknowledge to be a means of our immortal salvation.), "Wherefore—— *work out your salvation* with fear and trembling," [verse 12,] which is the same thing as the *bowing* and *confessing* in the preceding verse. It cannot, with any propriety, be said that this *salvation* which those Christians were to work out, refers to the present salvation from sin; for they were addressed as "saints in Christ Jesus;" [Phil. 1. 1.] and consequently they enjoyed the present salvation, and hence, the salvation which they were "to work out," must necessarily, and indisputably signify the future salvation beyond the present life.

But lastly, we have *Universalism against itself* by admitting that "*every*" means the *whole* without exception. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and *every* eye shall see him." [Rev. 1. 7.] Query: Did *the whole human family* see Titus (the Christ of Matt. 25th, accord-

ing to Universalism) come at the destruction of Jerusalem? If not, then the interpretation of Universalism is false.

**35.** Phil. 3. 21. According to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

Universalists contend that the *subduing* of all things, means the *salvation* of all things. But are they certain that *subdue* in the Bible means to *save?* Not quite: "Thou shalt build bulwarks against the city that maketh war with thee, until it be *subdued.*" [Deu. 20. 20.] i. e. saved! "And they slew of Moab at that time about ten thousand men, all lusty, and all men of valor, and there escaped not a man: so Moab was *subdued.*" [Jud. 3. 29.] i. e. *saved!* Of course they were, according to Universalism, by being killed, and sent to heaven.

Once more: "And he smote them from Aroer, even till thou come to Minith, even twenty cities, and unto the plain of the vineyards with a very great *slaughter; thus* the children of Ammon were *subdued.*" [Jud 11. 33.] i. e. they were *saved* with a very great *slaughter!* Wonder if that is the way the wicked are to be *saved* at the resurrection?

The word *subdue* occurs thirty-one times in the Bible, and in not one instance does it mean to *save*, nearly always to *destroy*. Among the *all things* which Christ is to subdue are included *sin*, *death*, *Hades* and the *devil*. Do Universalists believe that all these will be *saved?* We think hardly: and hence they have to admit that the word *subdue* does not mean to *save* but the opposite; consequently it is the old refrain:—*Universalism against itself.* A nation may be *subdued*, and instead of being saved, every one may be massacred. But let us ask Paul, if by Christ's being *able* to *subdue* all things he wishes us to understand that he is *able* to *save* all? The apostle answers No: —"He is *able* to *save* to the uttermost all those that *come unto God* by him." [Heb. 7. 25.] According to this, notwithstanding he is *able* to *subdue* all, yet he is only *able* to *save* those who *come unto God!* Thus the words *subdue* and *save* cannot mean the same thing. But Universalists appeal to 1 Cor. 15. 28. "And when all things shall be *subdued* unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him." From this it is contended that Christ is to be *subject* or *subdued* in the same sense of the "all things." Let us admit it, for the argument, and it follows that no man will be subdued in the resurrection in the sense of being saved from sin; for certain it is that if Christ be subdued at all it will not be in this sense. Hence the "all things" which are to be subdued must necessarily be limited to the righteous who alone will be "subject" to the Father (not subdued) as Christ is subject.

**36.** Col. 1. 20. And having made peace through the blood of his cross by him to reconcile all things unto

himself, by him I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

This text does not teach, as Universalists assert, that all things *will be* reconciled; but that Christ has made peace *to* reconcile all things. Yet all things may not be reconciled; from the fact that Christ died and made peace that many things might be done which are not done. And thus Paul declares, that by the grace of God he had preached the unsearchable riches of Christ "*to* make all men see." [Eph. 3. 9.] Yet all men will not see, for some "men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." (John 3. 19.) Suppose we should admit (which we do not) that Christ having made peace *to* reconcile all things, proves that they absolutely will be reconciled; still it would be a difficult task for Universalists to prove that *all things* means the whole human family. The phrase *all things* occurs four times in the verses preceding this proof-text. "For by him were *all things* created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth—*all things* were created by him and for him; and he is before *all things*, and by him *all things* consist."—(Verses 16, 17.) "*All things*," in these instances, signifies not only all mankind but all the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. Now as Universalists do not profess to believe that all the animals, vegetables and minerals which Christ has created will be reconciled in the sense of salvation and taken to heaven, it follows therefore that *all things*, when spoken of in connection with reconciliation must be limited. But to what extent? We would say, to *all things* that *can be* reconciled; which would leave out the incorrigible *sinner* as well as the unreconcilable *crocodile*. But Universalists will tell us, that Christ made peace *to reconcile all things* that need to be reconciled. Then we reply: Christ made peace not only to reconcile *all things* that need reconciliation, but also to reconcile them *when* they need it. Men need reconciliation now; yet Universalists are compelled to admit that all men are not *now reconciled*. Hence if there be a failure in one thing, as we see there is, may there not also be a failure in the other, and all things not be reconciled, notwithstanding Christ made peace that this might be accomplished? We pause for a reply.

But Universalists quote Rom. 5. 10. to prove that all who are reconciled will be saved. "Much more *being reconciled*, we *shall be saved* by his life." This however is a fatal text to Universalism. It proves that the future salvation of men depends upon "*being reconciled*," in the present tense; and as Universalists admit that the future salvation depends upon present reconciliation; and since Paul declares: "We pray you, in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled* to God," [2 Cor. 5. 20,] proving it to be conditional; it follows therefore that the future salvation depends upon conditions to be performed in this life, which is another clear demonstration of *Universalism against itself*.

But in order correctly to understand this subject we remark, that God has always had a time *when*, a place *where*, and means *by which* he works for man's happiness. Hence, if men are to be reconciled to God, the scriptures must point out the *time*, *place*, and *means* for its accomplishment. Let us examine, 1. The *time*. "You that were some time alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet *now* hath he *reconciled*." (Col. 1. 21.) This decides the time when men are to be reconciled. It is "*now*." 2. The *place*. "For to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace, and that he might *reconcile* both unto God *in one body*." (Eph. 2. 16.) The *one body* is the place: but what is to be understood by the *one body*? Paul answers: "And gave him to be head over all things to the *church*, which is his *body*." [Eph. 1. 22, 23.] 3. The *means by which* this reconciliation is to be effected. "All things are of God who *hath reconciled* us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the *ministry of reconciliation*,—and hath committed unto us the *word of reconciliation*." [2 Cor. 5. 18, 19.] Thus the *ministry*,—the *word*, or the *preaching* of the *gospel* is the means by which men are to be *reconciled* to God, or *saved*: for the gospel, Paul declares, "is the *power of God* unto *salvation*." [Rom. 1. 16.] In order now that Universalists may make this proof-text harmonize with their doctrine, they must prove three things. 1. That the gospel will be preached in the future state to those who die unreconciled. 2. That the ordinances of the gospel will be administered in *eternity*, to admit them to the "*one body*;" and 3. That *eternity* is "*now*." If Universalists preach to sinners that they will be reconciled by any other *means* than by the *ministry* of the *word*,—in any other *place* than the *one body*,—and at any other time than *now*; they will preach "another gospel," and Paul says: "Let them be *accursed*." [Gal. 1. 8.]

But lastly: *Universalism is against itself* by bringing this text to its support, when the context pointedly contradicts it "Yet *now* hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you *holy*, and *unblamable*, and *unreprovable* in his sight, [unconditionally? No! no! says Paul] *if* ye continue in the *faith*, *grounded*, and *settled*, and *be not moved away from the hope of the gospel*." [Verses 21–23.] Thus, all the argument based upon the unconditional reconcilation of men to God vanishes before this one declaration of the apostle. It proves, not only that reconcilation is conditional; but it also proves that men who are reconciled, in order to be presented *holy*, and *unblamable*, and *unreprovable* in the sight of God, must *continue* in the *faith*, or in other words, must hold out *faithful to the end*. This evidence is alone sufficient to condemn Universalism; and its condemnation is just.

**37.** 1 Tim. 2. 3, 4. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

1. Before *this text* can be made to favor Universalism, several

things must be proved. It must, in the first place, be proved that this text refers to the future state as the period when men are to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Universalists so understand it; but let this be once admitted, and we have Uuiversalism against itself: for if men are *saved* in the future state there must be something to be *saved from*, which Universalists deny. But to evade this, they may say true, there will be no sin nor misery in *eternity* to be *saved* from, but it simply has reference to a *salvation* from the *grave*. Suppose we admit this; it comes far short of proving that all men will be made holy and happy; for they may be saved, or delivered from the grave, and afterward condemned, as an abundance of scripture pointedly teaches. Jude, referring no doubt to this very thing, warns the brethern as follows: "I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord having *saved* the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward *destroyed* them that believed not." (Jude 5.) Thus may they be *saved* from the *grave*, and afterward *destroyed*. So Universalism must find some new exposition of this text, or remain against itself whenever it is quoted.

2. Let us inquire: when is the time to come to a knowledge of the truth? If Universalists say in the future state, then we can prove that they can sin in the future state, for Paul says: "If we sin wilfully, after that we have received the *knowledge of the truth*." (Heb. 10. 26.) But what time does the Saviour point out? "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall *know the truth*, and the *truth* shall make you free," (Jo. 8. 31, 32,) which is the same thing as to come to the *knowledge of the truth* and be *saved*. Thus we perceive that *now* is the time to come to the knowledge of the truth as well as to be reconciled to God; and Christ teaches that none can have that knowledge only such as continue in his word; and as Universalists admit that coming to the knowledge of the truth is essential to our future happiness or salvation, it follows hence that heaven is conditional, and thus again is Universalism against itself.

3. As we have seen that *now* is the time when God *wills* that men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved; it follows therefore that God's *will* is frustrated; for we know that all men are not now saved.—Universalists must necessarily prove that the *will* of God will certainly and in all cases be performed, before this ext will favor their theory, and then they would contradict innumerable existing facts. The context of this verse shows that God *wills* many things that are not done. "I *will* therefore that men *pray every where*, lifting up *holy hands*." (Verse 8.) Do men pray everywhere lifting up holy hands? If not, then what proof is there, that his *willing* all men to be saved by coming to a knowledge of the *truth is any more* likely to be accomplished? (See examination of *John 6. 39.)*

4. But it may be said, if God desires the salvation of all men, and all are not eventually saved then he must possess an ungratified desire to all eternity! We shall set this objection aside for the present, by turning it against Universalism. God, as we have seen, *wills* and *desires* that all men should be saved in this life. Now since all men are not saved in this life, it follows that God will eternally possess an ungratified desire, even if all should be saved in the future life. For the fact that all are not saved in this life, will remain a fact eternally, and the desire which God had for their present salvation will never be accomplished, unless they are actually saved in this present state of existence. Will Universalists say that the fact that all will be saved in the next life, will dispose of the matter; and the desire which God had for their salvation here, will cease? We answer that God is unchangeable "the same yesterday, to-day and forever."

5. But are Universalists sure that *all men*, embraces the whole human family? Not quite. But they tell us it is the same *all men* for whom Paul exhorts us to pray; and consequently must mean the entire posterity of Adam. But not so fast. Do Universalists believe in praying for the dead? If not, then *all* does not here mean a mathematical whole. Do they pray for the salvation of Enoch and Elijah? If not, then *all men* in this verse cannot, themselves being judges, embrace all mankind without exception, which again turns Universalism against itself. But the objector urges, that *all men* must at least embrace all the wicked that are now alive, as well as the righteous: and hence, as we are to pray for the salvation of all the wicked, we must believe therefore that they will be saved; for we are commanded to "ask in faith." (Jam. 1. 6.) But in reply to this, I would inform Universalists that when I pray for the salvation of the wicked, I pray conditionally, that is, I pray God to save them, *if* they turn from their wickedness; and I pray in faith, firmly believing that they will be saved *if* they reform. Still I do not pray for all men universally, even in this sense.—John says: "There is a sin unto death," [1 John 5. 16,] and forbids us to pray for it. There was also a class of men in the days of Jeremiah, for whom God would not allow his people to pray. "Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee." (Jer. 7. 16.) Universalists place great stress upon this matter of praying for the salvation of all men.—They tell us we must positively believe that they will be saved, or we cannot pray consistenly. Let us see now if in this case also we cannot turn Universalism against itself. Paul testifies: "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I *pray God* that it may not be laid to their *charge*." (2 Tim. 4. 16.) Universalists contend that God has irrevocably decreed that every sin a man commits must be laid to his charge, and punishment *for the same* must inevitably be inflicted. Now if Paul

was a Universalist, he, as a matter of course, believed that their sin would be laid to their charge: yet he prayed God that it might not be; which was praying for a thing he absolutely *knew* would not be granted! Did Paul pray in faith? How can Universalists dispose of this difficulty? In no possible manner except by renouncing their doctrine, and admitting that Paul was not a Universalist. But the apostle, not being a Universalist, could actually pray that their sin might not be laid to their charge, upon the same principle, that he could exhort us to pray for the salvation of the wicked, i. e. upon the condition of their reformation and obedience.

6. But it is further claimed that the verses immediately following this text favor Universalism: "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time." (Verses 5, 6.) It is assumed, that because Christ gave himself a *ransom* for *all*, therefore all will be ransomed. But a ransom may be prepared, and yet men may never be ransomed, because they will not accept it. A physician may prepare medicine for a whole town, in case of a fatal epidemic, but one half of the people may refuse to accept it and consequently die. Those who, through submitting to the gospel, receive an application of Christ's blood, are ransomed, and we read: "The *ransomed* of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joys upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." (Is. 35. 10.) If the bare fact of giving himself as a ransom, is all that is necessary in order that men may be ransomed, why were not all *ransomed* the instant the ransom was made? The fact that they were not, proves plainly that Christ, having done his part, has left the remainder for us to do, or never enjoy the benefit of that ransom.

7. Universalists claim that the word "*all*" here embraces the *whole human family.* This position destroys their doctrine; for Jude says: "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon *all*," (Jude 14. 15,] i. e. the whole human family: which certainly was not at the destruction of Jerusalem,—but must necessarily be at the resurrection of the dead; and thus, instead of having a universal salvation, it comes about as near a universal damnation; for he is "to execute judgment upon *all.*"

**38.** 1 Tim. 4. 9, 10. This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation: for therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.

1. It is contended that God is the Saviour of all men in the sense of *salvation from sin;* and that this salvation refers to the future state. This being true; then there is sin in that state to be saved from: and as Universalists tell us that sin and misery are always in*separably connected,* and as *all men* are to be saved from sin in a fu-

ture state: it follows therefore that *all men* will be sinful and miserable there.

2. But the text speaks of God as the Saviour of all men in the present tense: "Who *is* the Saviour of all men;" not who *will be* the Saviour of all men at the resurrection. God was the Saviour of all men in the days of Paul, and has been ever since, and yet all men have not been saved. Now if God can be the Saviour of all men 1800 years, without saving them, may he not be the Saviour of all men forever on the same principle, and yet some men be eternally lost? Some understand this to mean that God *is* the Saviour of all men in a temporal sense: but this does not appear to be the natural sense of the text, for two reasons. 1. The apostles never have used the word Saviour in this sense when applied to men under the Christian dispensation; and 2. God is not the Saviour of *all men* in a universal sense temporally, for millions have in this sense been lost. But if "*all men*" is to be limited, as it most probably is, then there is no necessity of confining it to this life, in order to refute Universalism. God can be the Saviour of all men in a spiritual sense, and all not be saved; just as Christ can be the Saviour of the world, and yet a part of the world be lost. The same way Universalism can be driven from one, it can be made to yield the other. [See examination of John 4. 42.]

3. But do Universalists believe that God is the Saviour of *all men* in the sense of the *entire human race?* They do not, and hence this text does not prove Universalism. Do they believe that all the human race will be saved from sin? No, for they claim justly that all who die in infancy, which is a large portion, are perfectly pure and uncontaminated by sin; hence if the whole human family are to be saved, it cannot mean a salvation from sin; so Universalism has to give up that point. But can it mean a salvation from the grave, and be understood in a total sense? No, for Universalists will not contend that Enoch and Elijah will be saved from the grave; neither will those who are alive and remain at the time of the resurrection according to the literal word (which in all probability will be millions), be saved from the desolation of the tomb. All men universally cannot be saved from an everlasting destruction beyond the grave; for Universalists tell us there is no such a thing to be saved from, nor ever will be: and as for all men universally being saved from an everlasting destruction in this life, none but the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem were ever in danger of it as threatened, according to Universalism. Hence Universalists are compelled to admit, that all men—universally—will not be saved in any sense from anything!

4. But in the last place we have Universalism against itself by quoting a text to sustain itself, when the context condemns it; "For bodily exercise profiteth little, but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the *life that now is*, and of that *which is to come.*" (Verse 8.) "This [mark it!] is a faithful saying, and worthy of *all acceptation,*" *i. e.* that eternal life,—the life which is to come is

conditional, and depends upon our practicing *godliness*. This is what the apostle declares to be the *faithful saying*, which is worthy of *all acceptation;* and not that all men will be saved unconditionally, whether they practice *godliness* or not!

**39.** Titus 2. 11. For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.

1. Universalists tell us that the correct rendering of this text is, "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared." To this we shall not object. But it is one thing to bring salvation to a man, and it is another thing for him to accept it. This text does not say: "the grace of God which *will bring* salvation to all men at the resurrection of the dead;" but in the present tense,—"*bringeth* salvation;" which proves that the apostle is speaking of a present salvation; which fact of itself destroys Universalism as far as this text is concerned, for no man will contend that all men do enjoy the salvation which the grace of God *bringeth* in the present tense. From the fact that the grace of God has brought *salvation to all men*, he therefore "commands *all men* every where to repent," [Acts 17. 30,] and *that* repentance which is "to *salvation*." [2 Cor. 7. 10.]

2. The context carries out the same idea, and consequently is opposed to Universalism. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us;"—So this grace *teaches* something, does it? but what? Why, Universalism of course,—that all the ungodly and profane,—that all liars, thieves, drunkards, murderers, that all who live without hope and without God in the world and die in their sins, are just as sure of eternal salvation as is the saint who dies in the Lord. But hear what the apostle says this grace of God teaches: "*Teaching* us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." [Verse 12.] But does our living godly in this present world, have anything to do with the life to come. Yes, says the apostle: "*Godliness* is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and *that which is to come*." [1 Tim. 4. 8.] And thus we discover most clearly, that Universalism is against itself by bringing Titus 2. 11 to its support.

**40.** Heb. 2. 9. But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

Universalists contend, that because Christ tasted death for every man, therefore every man will be saved from this *death* which Christ tasted. This might all be true, and yet Universalism be false. *But let us* inquire what death Christ tasted. He did not taste a *moral death, or a death* in sin; for he "did no sin, neither was

guile found in his mouth." [1 Pet. 2. 22.] Hence we cannot infer from this text, that all men will be delivered from sin; and Universalists will not assert that Christ tasted an endless death; for they tell us there is no such death to be tasted by any one. Hence it must be the literal *death* of the *body*, which Christ tasted for every man; and if all men are saved from this death, that is, delivered from the grave, resurrected, it will not prove them to be holy and happy; for, as before shown, the wicked will be saved or delivered from the grave, and afterward destroyed. So Universalism gains nothing from this text.

2. But it is claimed that *every man*, means the whole human family without exception. This admitted, and we have Universalism against itself; for the Saviour declares, that when he shall come in the glory of the Father, and with his angels, that "*then* he shall reward *every man* according to his works," [Math. 16. 27,] i. e. the whole human family without exception are to be rewarded according to their works when the Lord shall come; which proves that it was not at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that he will not thus come till the resurrection of the dead. Again: "Who *will render* to *every man* according to his works." (Rom. 2. 6.) This agrees perfectly with the declaration of the Saviour just quoted, and thus Universalists have to admit, therefore, that at the resurrection of the dead, the whole human race will be rewarded according to their works.

41. Heb. 8. 11, 12. For all shall know me, from the least to the greatest, for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.

"For all shall know me from the least to the greatest." All who? The answer is given in the preceding verse: "This is the covenant that I will make with the *house of Israel* after those days, saith the Lord." (Verse 10.) If this promise is to be understood in an unconditional, or absolute sense, still it would only prove the salvation of all the Jews from the least to the greatest who were living at the time the covenant was made, and not those who had lived before, or who should live afterward.—Proof: "To whom they all gave heed from the *least to the greatest.*" (Acts 8. 10.) Did all the Samaritans who would ever live, who were then living, or who had lived, give heed to Simon the socerer, and say he was the great power of God? No: none of the Samaritans, except those who were then living at that time. Again: God speaking of the Jews because of their disobedience, says: "They shall even be consumed by the sword, and by the famine; they shall die from the least even to the greatest." [Jer. 44. 12.] This text speaks for itself. Once more. "So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on

sackcloth from the *greatest* of *them even* to the *least* of *them.*" (Jonah 3. 5.) No one understands this to embrace more than the Ninevites who were then living. From this it follows, that the phrase: "All shall know me from the *least* to the *greatest;*" does not mean any more than those Jews who were alive when the covenant was made, which was in the days of the apostles; and as we have positive proof that none were forgiven under the apostles' administration, except upon the condition of submitting to the gospel, it follows hence, that there is a condition implied in this promise the same as in the promise to Abraham. (See examination of Gen. 22. 18.)

**42.** 1 John 2. 2. And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.

1. It is said, if Christ shed his blood to make a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and if the whole world is not saved, then Christ's blood must have been partly shed in vain. This however is but a specimen of the sophistry in which Universalism seems to be proficient. If but one man should be saved through the blood of Christ, not one drop of his blood would be shed in vain; for it takes all his blood to save one man; seeing it took all his blood to make a perfect sacrifice, and a perfect atonement; and the same perfect atonement that would save one man through submission to the divine economy, will save all men if they submit in like manner. The arrangements which placed the sun in the heavens, to give light to the whole earth will illustrate this. If a hundred men should crawl into some cave, and then complain, if the sun did not bend its rays to shine upon them in their dark retreat, that a part of the sun would shine in vain; what would we think of their logic? We would laugh at such simpletons, and tell them that it took the whole sun to shine for one man, and that the same luminous fountain which was sufficient to give light to one man, would be all sufficient to enlighten the whole earth; and if a million of ignoramuses should hide in dens and caves of the earth, no part of the sun would shine in vain as long as there was one man left to enjoy the light. So it is with the blood of Christ, "which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Math. 26. 28.) If men will accept of the propitiation thus made, they will enjoy its benefits; but if they, like the foolish men in the similitude, hide themselves in the caves and dens of moral darkness and depravity, the rays of the Sun of Righteousness will of course never reach them.

2. Universalism will in this case also be shown to be *against itself.* It is claimed that "*the whole world*" here means the whole race of Adam without exception. In the next chapter the apostle declares that, "*The whole world lieth in wickedness.*" [1 John 5. 19.] That is, the entire posterity of Adam, in the present tense, *lieth* in

wickedness! Now, since millions of the human family were then in another life, and at the same time *lying* in wickedness; and as sin and misery go hand in hand, it follows that, for thousands of years, all mankind who had died were suffering torment in the eternal world! So much by the way of a stand-off. But the phrase: "*the whole world*," and "*all the world*," does not in one single instance mean all mankind in the sense of totality. We have an example in Luke: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed." [Luke 2. 1.] Did "*all the world*" in this decree refer to the antediluvians? No. Did it include modern Universalists? No. Then *all the world* might be saved, and still Universalists and the antediluvians might be exceptions.

**43.** Rev. 5. 13. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.

1. In connection with this text is generally quoted Ps. 50. 23: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me." But let us see if all this proves Universalism. *Every creature* was heard to praise God. This proves too much for *every creature* will embrace all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fish of the sea and creeping things; and hence if this proves salvation in heaven to any, it proves the salvation of all animals for they are all creatures. Proof: "This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living *creature* that moveth upon the waters, and of every *creature* that creepeth upon the earth." [Lev. 11. 46.] And Paul speaking of different kinds of meat says: "Every *creature* of God is good." [1 Tim. 4. 4.] But Universalists will endeavor to avoid such absurdities, and will tell us that it is *unreasonable* to suppose that *brute beasts* were among those that could praise God; and hence they are not included in the number to be saved. But Peter speaks of some men who had become "as natural *brute beasts*, made to be taken and destroyed;" [2 Pet. 2. 12.] therefore it is unreasonable that they should praise God, and hence they will be excluded from the number of the saved, upon the same principle that you would exclude a *hyena!*

2. But Universalists tell us that this is all to take place in the future state after the resurrection, and that then there will be no beasts, fowls, fish, nor creeping things in existence; and consequently every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea, can praise God, without such creatures being included? We reply that if it refer to the state beyond the resurrection, then the wicked will also be banished with an everlasting destruction, and will neither be in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, nor in the sea; and consequently will not be included among the number that John heard

praising God. But it may be asked; does the Bible any where teach that the brute creation can praise God? Let us see. "Praise the Lord from the earth, ye *dragons*, and all deeps, fire and hail, snow and vapors, stormy wind fulfilling his word; mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars, *beasts*, and all *cattle, creeping things*, and *flying fowls*,—let them *praise the name of the Lord.*" [Ps. 148. 7–13.] And he winds up the whole by saying: "Let every *thing* that hath *breath* praise the Lord." [Ps. 150. 6.] Will all such be made holy and happy? "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me," which Universalists so frequently quote, only condemns the doctrine, for the remainder of the text reads: "And to him that ordereth his conversation *aright*, will I show the salvation of God," [Ps. 50. 23,] whereas Universalists tells us that all shall have the salvation of God, whether they order their conversation aright or not.

3. But if *every creature* in this proof-text is to be confined to human beings, it cannot be proved to mean one in ten thousand of the entire human family. Paul testifies to the Colossians, that the gospel had been "preached to *every creature* under heaven, whereof I Paul am made a minister." [Col. 1. 23.] This embraced only those who lived at that age of the world; and not those myriads who had lived before, and who have lived since. Thus we can with all safety admit that "*every creature*," in Rev. 5. 13, applies exclusively to rational beings, and yet myriads may never praise God in the sense here written.

4. But lastly: we have *Universalism against itself*, by admitting, that when John heard all these creatures praising God, there was a "*sea*," for he heard all that were in the *sea*, as well as those on the earth. Very good! But let us turn over a little further: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and *there was no more sea.*" Well what else did John see when there was no more *sea?* "The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers," &c., I saw "have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." [Verse 8.] Thus whilst there was a *sea*, John saw every creature praising God; but when there was *no more sea*, a different aspect presented itself. All the righteous were saved, and joyfully admitted into the New Jerusalem; whilst the wicked were doomed to the second death!

**44.** Rev. 21. 3, 4. And I heard a voice out of heaven saying, behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away.

1. *This text* we confess, has more the appearance of teaching uni-

versal salvation, than any other we have examined; and were it not for the context, we confess we should not know how to dispose of it. But with that assistance we can show that so far from teaching Universalism, it disproves the doctrine. The only question necessary to solve the difficulty, is this: Who are the *men* with whom God is to dwell? Who are to be his people? and from whose eyes is the Lord to wipe away all tears? And with whom is there to be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor pain? We answer: those who are in the city, the New Jerusalem, or the Tabernacle of God; which John at that time saw come down from Heaven. "And God himself shall be with them and *be their God.*" Whose God? Ans. "*He that overcometh* shall inherit all things, and I will be *his* God." (Verse 7.) Have none the promise of coming into this city, or temple of God, except those that overcome? "Him that *overcometh* [says Jesus] will I make a pillar in the *temple of my God*, and he shall go no more out." (Rev. 3. 12.) "But the fearful and unbelieving,—and all liars, [those who do not *overcome*,] shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the *second death.*" [Rev. 21. 8.] But can men avoid this *second death* by *overcoming?* Yes: "He that *overcometh* shall not be hurt of the second death." (Rev. 2. 11.) From this we discover that those who are *in the city*,—who *overcome*, and thereby escape the *second death*, are the *people* with whom God is to dwell, and be their God. "And God shall wipe away all tears from *their* eyes; and *there* [in the city] shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall *there* be any more pain."

2. Universalists in quoting and applying this text to the resurrection state, necessarily admit that then will be the time when the *city*, the *New Jerusalem*, is to come down from God out of heaven; and consequently that it cannot mean the church here in time. And if it can be shown that *admission* into this city is conditional, and that any will be debarred from it, it follows that they will be eternally lost, being shut out from the favor of God in the immortal state of existence: and Universalism will be *against itself* by the admission. Let us now inquire if admittance into this city depends upon obedience to God's commands. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may *enter in* through the gates *into* the *city.* [Rev. 22. 14.] "*If* any man shall *take away* from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall *take away his part* out of the book of life, and out of the *holy city.*" [Verse 19.] "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it,—and there shall in no wise *enter into it* any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or *maketh a lie;* but *they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.*" [Rev. 21. 24, 27.] This proves that some will be outside of that glorious city which Universalists thus admit to be beyond the resurrection, which is the most conclusive instance of Universalism against

*itself* yet presented. And thus is corroborated the testimony of the apostle Paul: "Here have we no continuing *city*, but we *seek* one to come." [Heb. 13. 14.] Those who will not seek it, will never enter therein.

3. This proof-text is exactly parallel with Is. 25. 8, which Universalists apply also to the resurrection. (See examination of that text.) Now since John declares that the lake of fire and brimstone,—the general judgment of the dead both small and great, and the second death all refer to the same period, Universalists are compelled to abandon both texts or admit that the "*lake of fire*,"—the *general judgment*, and the "*second death*," are all beyond the resurrection.

We thus close our examination of the texts of scripture mostly relied upon in support of the doctrine we are reviewing. We see by this careful analysis that the very strongest declarations, when examined under fair rules of interpretation and in the light of their contexts, come far short of proving the final happiness of men except upon the conditions stipulated in the divine record. In the light of this investigation thus far prosecuted, we ask, is it safe to trust to Universalism as a Bible doctrine, when not one of the leading texts hitherto relied upon in its support will bear the test of criticism? These texts have been taken for granted and have been quoted with apparent impunity by ministers of that faith without the least reference to their context, or without any careful regard to what the inspired writer intended. In this way the doctrine has gained adherents and thousands have been deceived in supposing that the Bible really teaches Universalism. We feel that we have performed but a simple duty to the public in this attempt to undeceive the misguided, and we submit it to all candid readers including Universalist clergymen.

## CHAPTER II.

### COMING OF THE LORD.

"*Unto them that look for Him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.*"—Heb. 9. 28.

The coming of Christ is fraught with incalculable interest to the Christian; yet, strange as it may appear to the reader, Universalism teaches that this important event took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, nearly 1800 years ago. This position is taken in order to avoid, if possible the admission of a future general judgment, which every where stands closely connected with the second coming of Christ. If Universalists could succeed in making the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans the date of this second advent of the Saviour, they could then, without fear of successful controversy, contend that the scattering of the Jewish nation, and the demolition of their metropolis and temple, was the scene of the general judgment so frequently referred to by Christ and his apostles. But if they fail in this particular, there is not an honest Universalist who would not acknowledge that the "*judgment day*," connected with the coming of Christ, is yet future. Let this be borne in mind. Universalists know full well that this conclusion must follow, and hence they have laid claim to several portions of scripture which, combined with their powers of mystification, have given a pretext of plausibility to their assumption.

Before presenting our proofs upon this subject, we will enter into an examination of the witnesses upon which Universalists rely to prove that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem. The 24th chapter of Matthew, with its parallels in Mark and Luke, forms the chief ground of Universalism upon this subject. In this chapter the doctrine has literally pitched its tent. Some of the opposers of Universalism have given up this chapter, and surrendered it to the service of that doctrine, so difficult does it seem to explain; but we propose to show the reader, before we close this chapter, that so far from favoring Universalism it is the most complete refutation of this doctrine that could be formed by the combination of language.

The Saviour in the first part of this chapter, after having described the wonderful catastrophe that was to come upon Jerusalem, and the unparalled tribulation of the Jews as a nation, stops short at verse 22 and adds, as if on purpose to refute Universalism: "*Then* (i. e. at the destruction of Jerusalem,) if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, *believe it not.*" As much as to say: if any man shall teach you the doctrine of Universalism,—that Christ

came at the destruction of Jerusalem, "*believe it not!*" Yet some will believe it, or profess to believe it, notwithstanding Christ has thus pointedly forbidden it. In the next verse he proceeds to advertise false christs, who should come at that time, and if possible deceive the very elect; and compares them to eagles, coming together to devour a carcass. As false christs were the only ones that made their appearance at that time, it follows that Universalism in persisting in their belief that Christ came then, holds to no christ but a false one! In verse 27, the Saviour throws in a sort of parenthesis, to show the difference between the coming of the Son of man, and these false christs: "For as the lightning cometh out of the East, and shineth even unto the West; *so* shall the coming of the Son of man be." Universalists claim that Christ came in this manner in the person of Titus, the Roman General. But Titus was six months or more, coming to destroy Jerusalem. Does it take the lightning six months to shine from the East to the West? In verse 29, he proceeds to tell the precise time when he shall make his second advent. Now, if Universalism be true, this coming will be placed at the very time Jerusalem is besieged. This we should look for as a matter of course if the doctrine be true. Let us see. "*Immediately after the tribulation of those days*, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and *then* shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." [Verses 29, 30.] We are aware that there is a spiritual meaning attached to these figurative or metaphorical expressions such as "the clouds of heaven," the "stars" falling from heaven, &c., which has a strong hold upon the judgment of some eminent biblical students. But we have no time in this discussion to stop and consider more than the literal and obvious meaning of the words employed, thus addressing our arguments to the common sense of the mass of Bible readers. Universalists attach no transcendental or correspondential meaning to the texts they quote here to favor their views of Christ's second coming. For the present, therefore, we purpose to take the same literal view of the word in opposing this, as we conceive, dangerous doctrine. With this view and understanding, the passages thus quoted forever exclude Universalism from the destruction of Jerusalem as the scene of Christ's second coming; for note the fact, that it is to be "*immediately after the tribulation of those days*," not just before, nor at the precise time that this tribulation commenced, which would have been the case, had Christ come figuratively in the person of Titus. Hence, Universalists are compelled to abandon the theory of the second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, or *flatly contradict* the Saviour. But they may tell us that we are as *deep in difficulty as themselves*, for we teach that the coming of the

Lord is yet future, and the Saviour pointedly declares that it is to be "*immediately after* the tribulation of those days!" But suppose we should be involved in difficulty would that help Universalism? But we are not. We take the ground that this second advent is to be *immediately after the tribulation of those days.* But we now inquire, what are we to understand by "*the tribulation of those days?*" In Matthew we have but the commencement of that tribulation recorded, which was the overthrow of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the Jewish temple; but we have the remainder of it in the parallel chapter in Luke. "For there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people; and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away *captive into all nations,* and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*" [Luke 21. 23, 24.] Thus, Luke has given us a full account of that *tribulation,* and how long it is to endure and not its mere commencement as in Matthew. He unlocks the mystery, and informs us that the tribulation of those days will continue as long as Jerusalem is "*trodden down of the Gentiles,*" and as long as the Jews remain *scattered* amongst the nations of the earth. Every man knows, who is at all acquainted with the history of the world, that Jerusalem is now at this very time, trodden down of the Gentiles, and has always been since the day it was sacked by the Romans; and the Jews have always been since that period, and are at this time scattered among *all nations,* and consequently the *tribulation of those days* yet continues! Let it be remembered by all that read, and by Universalists especially, that just so long as the Jews remain scattered and Jerusalem coutinues to be trodden under foot by the Gentiles, just so long will that tribulation continue; and just as certain as the Jews are now scattered amongst all nations, and Jerusalem is now trodden down of the Gentiles, just so certain is the coming of the Lord yet future according to this literal reading, for, mark the fact, he is not to come till the Jews return, and take possession of their old "beautiful Zion where Judah was glad," as he is not to make his second advent till their tribulation comes to an end!

But we are not alone in this view of the subject; for we have as good Universalist authority as can be produced, to prove that the punishment, or tribulation of the Jews, yet continues. G. W. Montgomery, in his sermon on the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew, makes the following statement: "If then the term everlasting reproach was applied to 70 years captivity, why may not the phrase everlasting punishment be applied to the Jews, when they *have endured the punishment for nearly* 1800 *years,* rather over 25 times 70 years." [Page 21.] This, in connection with what has been said, is sufficient to convince the unprejudiced, that the *tribulation of those days* yet continues, and consequently that the coming of Christ is yet *future since it is* not to occur till "after" that tribulation is ended.

But I have another argument against the doctrine of the second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, as based upon this chapter. We are informed in the next verse, that when the Lord comes: "He shall send his angels, with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;" [Math. 24. 31,] or, as recorded by Mark: "From the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven." [Mark 13. 27.] Stronger language could not be employed, than is here made use of, to express the entire number of all the elect of God, or saints of all ages. Now let me ask: were all the elect of God gathered together at the destruction of Jerusalem? A singular gathering truly! for what few of them were in the city, at the time ot its besigement, were commanded to "*flee into the mountains!*" If the Roman soldiers scattering the elect, is what is to be understood by the angels of the Lord gathering them together, then I have lost all idea of the meaning of language, and the Bible is, indeed, what Universalism makes it to be, a perfect enigma! If gathering the elect, means scattering them abroad, as Universalism would here teach, how, I ask, can it be made to appear that all will be saved, even if we could find positive testimony to that effect? Universalists are bound to admit, on their own principles, that it must mean directly the opposite of what it says; and accordingly, if the Bible should teach universal salvation, it would be positive proof that all would be damned! But again: if all God's elect children were gathered at the destruction of Jerusalem, then there have been none elected since; and as there is no promise of salvation to any but the elect through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; it follows, therefore, that all who have lived and died since that time, are lost, and thus Universalism, instead of holding forth a universal salvation, comes nearer a universal damnation, themselves being judges. But it is not likely that the angel will be commissioned to sound that great trumpet, and gather the elect, as long as there are any more that will be elected; and as there are hundreds and thousands yet being elected through the gospel of the grace of God; it follows, that the coming of the Lord, and the gathering of the elect are yet future. Paul also speaks of the coming of the Lord in the 15th of 1 Corinthians, in connection with the sound of "*the last trump*," and the "*resurrection of the dead;*" and in the 4th chap. of 1 Thess. he speaks of the *same things* precisely; and in the 2d epistle he speaks of the coming of Christ, "and our *gathering together* unto him;" [2 Thess. 2. 1.] showing plainly that the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the Lord, the commissioning of the angels, the sounding of the great trump, and the gathering of all the elect of God from the four winds, from the uttermost parts of the earth to the uttermost parts of heaven, are all simultaneous events; and as certain as the resurrection is yet future, as Universalists admit, *so certain are all the other* things here predicted.

But I am referred to verse 34, as the last resort of our opponents upon this chapter. "Verily I say unto you: this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." In order to know what is meant by this text, we must come at the true signification of the term "*generation.*" The most common meaning of the word *genea*, here translated *generation*, we admit to be an age of 30 years; but we have three reasons to assign, why it is not to be so understood in this case. 1. That *generation*, according to this definition, had passed away, and ten years over, before Jerusalem was destroyed.—Now, either the word *generation* here, is to be taken out of its common acceptation, or else the destruction of Jerusalem was not included in the things to take place before that generation passed away. If the latter, then Universalism must give up the idea of the second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, and is accordingly refuted; but if the former be the true idea, i. e. that the word *generation* is used out of its common acceptation, then Universalists gain nothing by the text, and are compelled to admit, that it may mean more than they say it does.

2. Martin Luther and Dr. George Campbell, whose translations are now before me, have the word *genea* translated *race*, referring to the Jewish nation, which has not yet become extinct. That *race of people* yet remain a separate and distinct nation, though scattered amongst all the nations of the earth, and consequently have not yet *passed away.*

3. The same word, here translated *generation*, is found in Ph. 2. 15, and is rendered "*nation*," in the common version. Had it been thus translated in Math. 24. 34, which could have been done with all propriety, then we would read: "Verily I say unto you: this *nation* [the Jews as a *people*] shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled;" that is, till Jerusalem shall be destroyed, the Jews scattered among all nations, the Son of man come in power and great glory, and until the angels shall be commissioned to gather the elect from the uttermost parts of the earth, to the uttermost parts of heaven. And as that *race*, that *generation*, or that *nation*, has not yet passed away, but retains all the peculiar characteristics of a distinct people that it ever did; it follows, that these events predicted by the Saviour (the last of which was his own personal appearing, and the gathering of the elect), have not yet all been fulfilled. This text then, so far from favoring the idea of the coming of the Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem, is but another confirmation of its fallacy; and exactly corresponds with the fact of his second advent immediately after the Jewish tribulation comes to an end; and we have produced insuperable evidence, both from the Bible, and a standard author among the Universalists, that the tribulation, there spoken of, yet continues; and that per consequence, the coming of the Lord is yet future! Having thus entered the citadel of Uni-

versalism, and forced a surrender, we shall have but an easy task with its smaller fortifications.

We are referred to Math. 10. 23: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you; ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Universalists tell us that the coming here spoken of, relates to the sacking of Jerusalem. But this cannot possibly be the idea; for Paul tells us, many years before Jerusalem was destroyed, that the gospel had not only been preached to all the cities of Israel, but had "been preached to *every creature under heaven;*" [Col. 1. 23,] and "their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world." [Rom. 10. 18.] Thus, the apostles had gone over the cities of Israel, long before the destruction of Jerusalem; and hence Universalism is compelled to abandon this text, for it declares that this coming is to take place *before* they shall have gone over the cities of Israel! But if Universalists would take into consideration the context of this verse, they would find that it was spoken under, and with reference to the apostles' first commission; which circumscribed their preaching, and confined it "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." [Verse 6.] This commission came to an end, when Christ "broke down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles," and "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." [Eph. 2. 14., Col. 2. 14.] Then the Jewish dispensation ceased, and Christ completed his first coming, as Universalists admit, when he arose from the dead. Thus the apostles had not gone over the cities of Israel, until the Son of man had come from the grave! But should the reader feel disposed to doubt just here, and urge that the apostles must necessarily have finished their first mission, before Christ died; and consequently that they must have gone over the cities of Israel before Christ came from the grave, we reply: this being so, it just as effectually breaks down Universalism, since it proves that the *coming*, here referred to, was accomplished before his death, for the text states that he was to come *before* the apostles had gone over the cities of Israel! This might all be true, and the *coming*, of which the Saviour here speaks, signify his coming into Jerusalem, as predicted by the prophet Zachariah: "Behold, thy king *cometh unto thee*, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." [Math. 21. 5, Zach. 9. 9.] It is certainly a little strange that Universalists can never draw the sword without self-destruction. But in connection with this text they quote Math. 24. 14. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and *then shall the end come.*" They prove that this refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, from the fact that Paul declares that the "gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven." [Col. 1. 23.] But mark the language of the Saviour: "*then* shall the *end* come." When? Ans. When the gospel shall be *preached for a witness* to all nations. And in their own proof-text,

Paul declares that the gospel had been preached to all nations, many years before Jerusalem was destroyed, which proves, themselves being judges, that "the *end* [did] *come*," altogether too soon for Universalism! But what is to be understood by the "*end*" which is to *come* when the gospel shall be preached to all nations? If it be understood to signify the *end* of the Jewish dispensation, then we can prove that the *end* came just before or at the day of pentecost; for on that occasion the gospel was preached to all nations, in a very important sense, as there were men present, from "*every* nation under heaven." [Acts 2. 5.] But if the *end* here spoken of refers to the end of the Jewish *nation*. then the *end* has not yet *come*, for that nation yet exists, although their city was destroyed. But if the gospel preached in *all* the *world* for a witness to *all nations*, is to be understood universally, that is, to mean not only the people that were then living, but all who should afterward live, then the "*end*" has not yet *come*, and must consequently refer to the end of the world, or the end of time. This doubtless is the true idea of the text; yet it cannot favor Universalism, as we have seen, let it mean what it may!

Again: In order to fix the second advent at the destruction of the Jewish capital, we are referred to another text: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." [Math. 16. 27, 28.] Universalists contend that this "*coming in his kingdom*," which some who were then standing by should see before they tasted death, is the same as his coming in the glory of his Father to *reward every man according to his works*, spoken of in the preceding verse. But here lies the mistake. Verse 27 refers to the same coming spoken of in Math. 24. 29, 30, which we have examined, and proved to refer still to the future: but verse 28 refers to a different matter altogether, and is explained by Mark to relate to the day of pentecost; and his explanation shows beyond controversy that the phrase "*coming in his kingdom*," means no more nor less, than "*the kingdom of God come with power*." The fact that in Matthew the two verses stand connected together, does nothing in favor of Universalism; for in Mark they are separated by chapters. We shall quote them: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with his holy angels. And he said unto them, verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the *kingdom of God come with power*." (Mark 8. 38, and 9. 1.) This shows what is meant by "the *Son of man coming in his kingdom*;" or as rendered by Dr. Geo. Campbell: "until you see the Son of man enter upon his reign." The kingdom of God

coming with power, and the Son of man entering upon his reign, were both inseparably connected, and took place on the day of pentecost, as recorded in the 2d of Acts. Luke, in recording the same matter, has given it thus: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." [Luke 9. 27.] It is the opinion of some, that this coming of Christ *in glory*, was fulfilled after six days, when Christ was transfigured upon the mount, in the presence of Peter, James, and John. But for some cause I cannot see it; though I can produce, as I think, three substantial reasons against it. 1. Christ, when he came in this manner, was to "*reward every man* according to his works." This certainly was not done upon the mount of transfiguration! 2. If the Saviour refers to his metamorphosis upon the mount, then it was no more *his* coming, than that of Moses and Elias; for they all "*appeared in glory.*" [Luke 9. 31.] 3. It is not at all likely that the Saviour looked only six days ahead, when he made this prediction: "There be *some* standing here, which shall not taste of death, *till* they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom," implying, as any one can see, that many of them *should taste of death* before that event transpired, whilst there is no evidence, and but little probability, that *any* who were then standing by, tasted of death before the transfiguration. I am aware that the testimony of Peter is appealed to as sustaining the above position: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you, the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ; but were eye witnesses of his majesty: for he received from God the Father, honor, and glory, when there came such a voice from the excellent glory; This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: and this voice, which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." [2 Pet. 1. 16–18.] But, mark the fact, Peter does not say that the exhibition which he saw in the mount, was the "*power and coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ," which he had made known to those brethren: but he had made known to them the future advent of Christ, when he should come in *power and great glory;* and as an evidence that such would be the case, he refers them to what he had witnessed: and the fact, that Christ possessed such glorious power on the mount of transfiguration, of which Peter was an eye witness, is a demonstration that such will be his splendid and glorious appearance when he comes the second time without sin unto salvation. But the whole matter, we think, is more simple, and far more easily understood, if we let Mark explain Matthew; which shows that "the Son of man *coming in his kingdom*," which was to take place in the life-time of some who were then standing by, signifies nothing more than "*the kingdom of God coming with power*," or "the Son of man *entering upon his reign*," which must be admitted by all, to refer to *the* day of pentecost! But I wonder how Universalists would dispose of the matter, should we take the same turn with this text, that

they do with Luke 20. 35: "They which shall be counted *worthy* to obtain that world?"—and contend, that because Matthew is the only one of the evangelists who makes use of the phrase: "the Son of man *coming in his kingdom*," hence it was a matter of little importance, or Luke and Mark would not both have omitted it! Universalists could not object to this logic, for it is of their own manufacturing. But we do not dispute the text, although Matthew is alone; neither do we stand in need of any such subterfuge under which to shelter the cause we advocate; yet we do claim the right of letting God be his own interpreter, and of making two texts of scripture upon the same subject harmonize and explain each other. Again: We could adopt the *logic* of Universalism and contend that "*taste of death*," does not mean the death of the body, or is not to be understood literally, but must signify a moral or spiritual death, and as some of the apostles, who were then standing by have never yet tasted that kind of death, it follows that the coming of the Lord then referred to is yet future! But as we remarked before, we do not depend upon any such forced construction, or sophistical perversion to aid our exegesis.

But we are referred to the conversation of Christ with Peter, concerning John: "Peter seeing him said to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him: If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him he shall not die; but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" [John 21. 21–23.] This was one of the principal texts relied on by G. W. Montgomery, to prove that the Lord came at the destruction of Jerusalem: and his effort is admitted, by Universalists, to be the best that can be made upon that subject. But this, like most of their other texts, proves the very opposite of Universalism. Let us look at it. Now mark the fact, that this conversation took place after Christ had arisen from the dead,—after he had been teaching his disciples three years and a half, and as Universalists contend, in almost every discourse giving them to understand that he was to come at the destruction of Jerusalem, in about 46 years from that time. The disciples must have understood this matter perfectly, having been taught it so repeatedly; yet, notwithstanding all this, when they understood the Saviour to say that John should tarry *till he come*, they all drew the conclusion at once that John would never die!—Why will he never die? Because he is going to tarry, or remain alive till the Lord shall come; and of course he will never die if he lives that long; for that will be at the end of time! This then is the way all the disciples understood the matter,—that if any man live till the Lord shall make his second appearance, as that is what they supposed he meant, he would never die; as there would be no more going down to the *grave after that* period. Hence it is as clear as the sun at

noon-day, that the disciples did not understand the destruction of Jerusalem as the time of Christ's second advent; for they knew full well that men, who would live till that event should take place would be just as likely to die afterward as before!

But in the last place, Universalists bring forward a number of texts, which we shall now examine, and which are believed to sustain the doctrine of the second advent. at the destruction of Jerusalem. "For yet *a little while*, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." [Heb. 10. 37.] "Be ye also patient, establish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord *draweth nigh*." [Ja. 5. 8.] "Behold I *come quickly*, and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." [Rev. 22. 12.] "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophesy, and keep those things which are written therein, for the *time is at hand*." [Rev. 1. 3.] These texts, with a few others of the same import, form a very considerable argument with Universalists generally, in favor, as they suppose, of the second advent of Christ in the person of Titus. But we shall give a sort of wholesale reply, which will set Universalism aside as far as they all appear to affect the case. The main question to be settled is this: In what sense are we to understand the coming of the Lord in the above texts, as *nigh* or *at hand*? We answer thus: Whenever a man dies, time comes to an end with him, individually and personally, just as much as though the earth should cease to revolve, and the sun be plucked from the heavens. Suppose a thousand years shall yet elapse in the history of the world, before the Lord shall come, and I should die in twelve months from this date; there would be to me, but twelve months of time between this and the coming of the Lord: although in point of duration, there would still be 999 years. Thus to me, the coming of the Lord would be *at hand*, because only at the distance of twelve months: and thus it was with the primitive saints; they could live but a few years at most, and when they closed their eyes in death, it would be the same to them, as though the Lord had *then come;* for time would then come to an end, as far as they were concerned; and though 1800 years have since rolled away, not one moment of that time counts for them,—their age is not increasing, but remains the same, and thus the coming of the Lord was then *at hand*, was even as *near* to them 1800 years ago, as it is to us now, unless he should come personally before we die. This is the true, and in my judgment, the only consistent way of looking at all those texts. It could thus be said with all propriety, to all who were then living.—"Yet *a little while*, and he that shall come, *will come, and will not tarry*." But Universalists assert that *a little while* is here to be understood literally, and for no other reason apparently than because it seems to favor their views.—But let us inquire how much a *little while* is, when understood literally according to Universalism? From the *time that Paul penned* that statement until the destruction of Jeru-

salem, the time which Universalists mark out for the coming of the Lord, was 23 years. A *little while* may also literally mean a few minutes. The landlady says she will set the table for dinner in a *little while:* that is, in a few minutes. A "little while" cannot in this case mean 23 years, certainly! Now if *a little while* can literally mean fifteen minutes, and at the same time literally mean 23 years, more then eight hundred thousand times as long, may it not also on the same principle mean 1800 years,—in the mind of him who sees the end from the beginning? The truth is, Universalists have an easy way of proving their doctrine, and refuting that of their opponents. Every passage which appears to favor the theory of Universalism, must be understood *literally* let the circumstances be as they may; but every text against them, let it be never so pointed and emphatic, is nothing but an eastern metaphor! Paul declares that "God has appointed *a day* in the which he will judge the world." [Acts 17. 31.] A *day* literally means twenty-four hours; but Universalists, without any hesitancy, contend that it here means the *whole Christian dispensation!* Now if *one day* can mean more than 1800 years, may not a *little while*, (which Universalists admit to be literally 23 years, more than 8000 times as long as a day) also mean the same thing? If Universalists are not willing to admit the true and obvious meaning of these texts, as expressed above; they can be made to admit any other idea we may choose, by turning their own logic against them. When Christ says, Behold I *come quickly*, how do Universalists know but that he used the word *quickly* in comparison with eternity? Even if he was not to come till 1800 years after; an eye that could scan eternity at a single glance, could look upon that length of time as a mere trifle, since Peter has declared: "That one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." [2 Pet. 3. 8.] But if the coming of the Lord "*at hand*," proves that it took place at the destruction of Jerusalem; how will Universalists explain this?—"But the end of *all things is at hand.*" [1 Pet. 4. 7.] They dare not interpret it to suit their Jerusalem *hobby;* for some things have existed and some events have transpired since! But the end of *all things* was *at hand*, in the same sense of the coming of the Lord, as above explained. The way Universalists understand the coming of the Lord as *at hand*, they make the apostles clash; for Paul testifies, that the man would be a deceiver who would teach, "that the day of Christ is at hand." [2 Thess. 2. 2.] And adds: "Let no man *deceive* you by *any means* [no, not even by the sophistry of Universalism,] for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." [Verse 3.] Thus, we would have a pointed contradiction between the apostles according to the interpretation of Universalists; but when we consider that one is speaking with reference to the history of the church and Christ's personal coming, when he puts the day of Christ a great ways off; and the other, as

speaking to individual brethren with direct reference to their departure from this life, when time to them would come to an end, and the coming of the Lord would thus be *at hand*, the discrepancy disappears and the whole matter is plain enough. But, finally, upon this part of the subject we remark: that Universalism makes all those joyful promises connected with the coming of the Lord, which we have been examining, but so many records of falsehood. They were once true, but they are true no longer and might just as well be expunged from the New Testament. No man can now console the afflicted saints with the promise that "the coming of the Lord draws nigh," and "he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." No; for this is now false, it all took place at the coming of Titus, and thus Universalism "turns the truth of God into a lie;" and as the power of the gospel consists in the motives which it holds forth, hence Universalism paralyzes the gospel by placing all its thrilling, and soul-stirring motives in the past! They thus preach another gospel, or, as the apostle says, which is not another, but a *perversion* of the gospel of Christ. If this doctrine be true, well may we take up the language of the latter-day scoffers and ask: "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, [i. e. since Jerusalem was destroyed,] all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." [2. Pet. 3. 4.]

---

*Twenty-five Scriptural reasons for believing that the Coming of the Lord did not take place at the destruction of Jerusalem,—and that it is yet future.*

1. *He is to come literally.* Proof: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This *same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*" [Ac. 1. 11.] "*The Lord, himself*, shall descend from heaven." [1 Thess. 4. 16.]

Remarks: As certain as Jesus went to heaven *literally*, so certain will he return *literally;* for, "This *same Jesus* [not his *effigy* or *likeness*,] shall *so come* in *like manner*:" not *figuratively*, but literally, for in *this manner* they saw him go up,—not in the person of some one else. "The *Lord himself* shall descend from heaven," not his *personification* by Titus! "The *Lord himself*," is the same as "*the Lord literally.*" The Saviour says on one occasion, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is *I myself*," [Luke 24. 39,] that is, *literally the Lord!* "To them that look for him shall he appear the *second* time." "The *second* time," will be as literal as the first; and as Universalists do not contend that he came literally at the destruction of Jerusalem, he therefore did not then come the *second time*, *and* consequently did not come at all; for we have no account in the *Bible of any but his first* and *second* advents: and as no one contends

that he has appeared since that time, it follows that the second appearing of Christ is still future.

2. *He shall come with the clouds of heaven.*—Proof: "Behold he cometh with *clouds*." [Rev. 1. 7.] "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the *clouds of heaven*, with power and great glory." (Math. 24. 30.)

Remarks: This certainly was not fulfilled in the person of Titus; —he came from the city of Rome upon the ground; not in the *clouds of heaven!* We take all this just as Universalists take every text which seems to favor their doctrine, that is, literally, and they have no right to object.

3. *He shall come with all the holy angels.* Proof: "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels* with him." (Matt. 25. 31.)

Remarks: Universalists contend that the Roman soldiers along with Titus, are what is meant by the *angels* who were to accompany Christ. Yes, indeed, those *wicked, abominable, blood-thirsty* soldiers, were a very fit *representation* of the *holy angels* of God!

Query: If Titus and his soldiers were a personification of Christ and his angels, what would it take to personify the devil and his imps?

4. *He shall come with ten thousand of his saints.* Proof: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying: Behold the Lord cometh with *ten thousand* of his *saints* (Jude 14.)

Remarks: Had Titus ten thousand saints with him, when he came to destroy Jerusalem? It is truly strange, that Enoch should look forward through so many thousands of years, and look over unnoticed, the destruction and desolation of so many mighty cities and kingdoms of renown, and place the coming of theLord with ten thousand of his saints, in the person of Titus and the Roman army!

5. *He shall come with the great God.* Proof: "Looking for that *blessed hope*, and the glorious appearing of the *great God*, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." (Tit. 2. 13.)

Remarks: Did the *great God* come along with Titus, the Roman general, to assist him in destroying the Jews? and was that *massacre*, the "*blessed hope*" for which the disciples looked? When Paul *hoped* that there would "be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust" (Ac. 24. 15.), Universalists tell us that he could not have *hoped* for the resurrection of the *unjust* to punishment; yet, according to their doctrine, Paul commanded the disciples to look forward with a *blessed hope* to the time when the Lord Jesus should appear in the person of Titus, to murder the Jews, and cause the greatest national tribulation that has ever been since the commencement *of time!* Query: If Titus enjoyed the communion and com-

pany of the *great God*, what would it require to give a man the company and fellowship of the *great devil?*

6. *He shall come in flaming fire.* Proof: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire.*" [2 Thess. 1. 7, 8.]

Remarks: At the time Jerusalem was destroyed, Rome, for idolatry and wickedness of every description, was the metropolis of the world! Yet, Titus coming from that seat of iniquity was, according to Universalism, a most manifest representation of the Lord Jesus coming from heaven, the abode of purity and bliss! But the personification is also lame in another respect. Titus did not come *in flaming fire.* All the *flaming fire* in that case was the conflagration of the temple just *after* Titus had come, and had broken down the walls of their city! Query: If *Rome* was a correct representation of *heaven* from whence the Lord came, how could any thing approximately personify *hell!*

7. *The kingdom of God shall then come.* Proof: "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the *kingdom of God* is nigh at hand." [Luke 21. 31.]

Remarks: There were but two kingdoms promised: one the kingdom of grace, and the other the everlasting, or ultimate kingdom of glory. Neither of these kingdoms came at the destruction of Jerusalem. The kingdom of grace commenced when Christ was exalted at the right hand of God, at least 37 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and people were then admitted into it. (See Col. 1. 13.) The kingdom of glory has not yet come, and will not till the resurrection of the dead, when the saints shall be "*raised in glory.*" Hence, there was no kingdom appeared at the time Titus made his advent against the Jews, and consequently the appearing of Christ, which is to be simultaneous with the coming of this kingdom, is yet in the future!

8. *His appearing will be universal.* Proof: "Behold he cometh with clouds, and *every eye shall see him.*" [Rev. 1. 7.] "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered *all nations.*" [Math. 25. 32.] "For, as a snare shall it come on *all them* that dwell on the face of the *whole earth.*" (Luke 21. 35.)

Remarks: If any language in the Bible can be made to express Universality, this fully meets the case. But the appearing of the Roman army, so far from being Universal, affected only a small district of country in the land of Palestine. Did this come upon *all them* that dwell upon the face of the *whole earth?* Where were the inhabitants of all Europe, and Africa,—the major part of Asia, and *the islands of the seas?* The destruction of Jerusalem certainly did *not come upon all them!*—Did *every eye* see Christ come during

that campaign?—The word "*every*," Universalists tell us, as we have before shown in many passages which they think favor their doctrine, means the whole human family without exception. "By thy words thou shalt be condemned."

9. *He shall come upon the wicked unawares.* Proof: "For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them,—and they shall not escape." (1 Thess. 5. 2, 3.) "For in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and *knew not*, until the flood came and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Math. 24. 38, 39.) "The Lord of that servant shall come, in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of." (Math. 24. 50.)

Remarks: The day of the destruction of Jerusalem, did not come upon the wicked Jews unawares, for they were fully apprised of the intention of the Romans, and made preparation to meet the attack. That day did not come upon them as a *thief*, in an *hour* that they were not looking for it, for they knew a long time before hand, that the Roman legions would certainly appear; and when sudden destruction came upon them, they were not saying *peace and safety;* for at that time they had internal wars and insurrections, spreading devastation throughout the whole city! Neither were they at that time, marrying and giving in marriage; neither were they feasting, as they were in the days just before the flood, or as they will be when the Lord comes; for when the Romans besieged the city starvation and wretchedness stalked abroad in their most horrid form; and were to be seen depicted in every countenance;—whilst the ladies of the highest rank, satisfied their hunger upon the flesh of their own offspring! This had but little the appearance of either a *wedding* or an *infare!* But thousands of the Jews escaped at the time their city was besieged; though this will not be the case with the wicked, when the Lord shall come; for the apostle says: "they shall not escape," and as the flood came upon the wicked antediluvians "and swept *them all away*, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." He shall come "with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon *all*, and to *convince all* that are ungodly among them, of *all* their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed; and of *all* the hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." [Jude 15.] Did Christ, in the person of Titus, *convince all* the ungodly Jews? No, for they fought till the very last.—None of them were convinced by the arguments made use of on that occasion! Did he execute judgment at the destruction of Jerusalem for *all* the *hard speeches* which ungodly sinners have spoken against him? How about those blaspheming infidels, who now assert that the

blood of Christ is no more efficacious in saving sinners than the blood of a dog? Was judgment executed upon them at the destruction of Jerusalem?

10. *He shall come with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.* Proof: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the *voice of the archangel*, and with the *trump of God.*" [1 Thess. 4. 16.]

Remarks: The voice of the archangel was not heard at the destruction of Jerusalem; and as for the *trump of God*, Paul declares *that* to be at the *resurrection of the dead* [1 Cor. 15. 52.] as Universalists admit; and hence the coming which is to take place in connection with these events must be yet *future!* Query: If the music of the Roman soldiers was the *trump of God*, how think you would the trump of Satan sound?

11. *The dead shall be raised.* Proof: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the *dead* in Christ *shall rise first.* [1 Thess. 4. 16.]

Remarks: Universalists tell us, that this cannot refer to the future, from the fact that some who were then alive were to witness it; and that in the next verse the apostle says: "*We* which are alive and remain." From this it is claimed that the apostle, as well as those whom he then addressed, would actually live to witness the *coming* of Christ here referred to. But Paul died, Universalists admit, before Jerusalem was destroyed, and hence, if Paul was included in the personal pronoun *we*, it saps the foundation of Universalism, and proves that the second advent of Christ was all over with several years before Jerusalem was destroyed! We will now turn their logic against them.—In 1 Cor. 15, they admit Paul to be speaking of the literal resurrection. Very good! In verse 51, he remarks: "Behold I show you a mystery: *we* shall not all sleep." Now according to the above argument, Paul, and those addressed by him would not die until the literal resurrection of the dead! And as Paul, as well as all those addressed at that time, were doubtless dead and in their graves before fifty years from that time it follows, that the resurrection has been past for more than seventeen centuries! And as Universalists place the salvation of all men at the resurrection;—hence all men were saved nearly 1800 years ago and before only a fraction of them had been born. But the pronoun *we*, does not refer to those living at that particular time; but simply personates Christians, and thus we understand the text: "*We* which are alive," that is, the *Christians* which are alive, "and remain unto the coming of the Lord," &c. But the resurrection he referred to did not take place at the destruction of Jerusalem nor any part of such a resurrection, for there i no history in existence that records the resurrection of a single individual as having occurred on that occasion; whilst we *have the best authenticated* testimony in the world, that more than

a million of human beings were slain! Is this the kind of *resurrection* believed in by Universalism? Do they *hope* for it?!

12. *The living and the dead shall be judged.* Proof: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *judge the quick and the dead* at his *appearing* and his kingdom." [2 Tim. 4. 1.]

Remarks: Universalists will tell us that it is the *dead* that Christ is to judge at his appearing, and not the *living:* hence it must refer to the *morally dead,* which was the case at the destruction of Jerusalem! But we remark that the *dead,* in such connections as this, simply means those that *had been dead!* We can adduce parallel examples in abundance to sustain this position. "But some man will say: how are the *dead* raised up?" (1 Cor. 15. 35.) Were they to be raised up *dead?* that is, were they to be *dead* at the time they were raised up? or, were they to be made alive first and afterward raised up? We must admit the latter without doubt; and thus the meaning is: "How are the dead [after being made alive] raised up?" So it is with Christ in judging the *dead,* that is, those that *had been dead,* but are made alive again. What are we to understand from this phrase? "It came to pass when the devil was gone out, the *dumb spake.*" (Luke 11. 14.) Does it mean, that the man was actually *dumb* at the time he *spake?* No, for this would be a contradiction in terms. But the idea is this: He that *had been dumb* spake, after having been restored to his speech! So when we read that John "saw the *dead* small and great stand before God" to be judged; it has reference to those who *had been dead* both small and great and were made alive, and then brought to stand before God. This is plain common-sense criticism.

13. *The saints shall obtain redemption.* Proof: "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory; and when these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your *redemption* draweth nigh." (Luke 21. 27, 28.)

Remarks: What redemption was it for which the disciples were encouraged to look at the coming of Christ with such joyful anticipation? Was it redemption from the persecuting Jews, at the destruction of their city? No, for if redemption from persecution was the thing for which they were looking, they were sadly disappointed, for they utterly failed to obtain it. Paul declares: "And all that will live godly in Chrst Jesus, *shall suffer persecution.*" (2 Tim. 3. 12.) At the destruction of Jerusalem the disciples were delivered out of the hands of their enemies, whose power was circumscribed, into the hands of others, whose power against the professors of Christianity was as unlimited as their hatred! Did the redemption for which they were to look consist in the forgiveness of sins, through *the blood of Christ?* No, for this the disciples enjoyed many years

too soon for the second advent of Universalism. (See Col. 1. 14.) What then was the redemption for which the disciples hoped? Paul answers: "Waiting for the adoption to wit: the redemption of our body." (Rom. 8. 23.) Hence the *redemption* which Christians are to obtain at the coming of their Lord, is redemption from the desolations of a literal death by a real resurrection. Query: If the disciples enjoyed a state of *redemption* after Jerusalem was destroyed, when they were devoured by wild beasts, and massacred by thousands; what think you must have been their state of bondage?

14. *The saints shall all be gathered to Christ.* Proof: "Now we beseech you brethren by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our *gathering together unto him.*" [2 Thess. 2. 1.] "Then [when he comes] shall he send his angels, and shall *gather together his elect,* from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth, to the uttermost part of heaven." [Mark 13. 27.]

Remarks: The saints were not gathered to Titus at the siege of Jerusalem, for the Saviour commands them to flee into the mountains, as soon as they should see the Roman army approaching! Query: If the disciples were gathered together to Titus, the Roman general, what way would we adopt to get them scattered abroad?!

15. *The bodies of the saints shall be changed, and be made like unto Christ.* Proof: "For our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change our vile body,* that it may be *fashioned like unto his glorious body.*" [Phil. 3. 20, 21.] "We shall not all sleep, but we *shall all be changed,* in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the *last trump;* for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we shall be changed.*" [1 Cor. 15. 51, 52.] "We know that when he shall *appear, we shall be like him;* for we shall see him as he is." [1 John 3. 2.]

Remarks: Were the vile bodies of the saints *changed* at the destruction of Jerusalem, and made like the *glorious* body of Titus? This changing cannot refer to that event, for Paul has decided that it relates to the resurrection of the dead; and that too in the very chapter claimed by Universalists, and acknowledged by them to refer still to the future! Query: If the bodies of the saints were *changed* to immortality at the destruction of Jerusalem, and were still subject to corruption and death; what must they have been before they were changed.

16. *The saints shall appear with Christ in glory.* Proof: "When Christ, who is our life, shall *appear,* then shall ye also *appear with him in glory.*" [Col. 3, 4.]

Remarks: Did the apostles and Christians appear with Titus in his glory? Not if they fled to the mountains the way they were directed to do by the Saviour. Query: If those who were engaged with, and appeared in the company of Titus, were exalted to a state of

*glory*, who, since the world began, was ever degraded to a state of *infamy?*

17. *The saints shall admire the Lord when he appears.* Proof: "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be *admired in all them that believe.*" [2 Thess. 1. 10.]

Remarks: Did *all believers* admire Titus who, according to Universalism, was a personification of Christ? Did Universalists admire him? If not, they must admit that they are not *believers*, for all believers are to hail the appearing of Christ with joy and admiration. Query: If the believers running away from Titus with terror and dismay, was *admiring* and *glorifying* him: what plan could they have adopted to treat him with *dishonor* and *contempt?*

18. *It will be a day of consolation to all believers.* Proof: "But rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be *revealed*, ye may be *glad* also with *exceeding great joy.*" [1. Pet. 4. 13.] "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober and hope to the end, for the *grace* that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." [1 Pet. 1. 13.] "Wherefore *comfort* one another with these words." [1 Thess. 4. 18.]

Remarks: Was it a comfort and a consolation to the saints to reflect that Christ was going to come at the head of the Roman army, and drive them all from their homes into the mountains, where they would have to wander in sheep skins and goat skins, in dens and caves of the earth, being *destitute, afflicted* and *tormented?* Is this the kind of consolation held out by Universalism, in order to make the disciples "*glad with exceeding great joy?*" Query: If the Lord came in the person of Titus to *bless* men, how would he come if he were going to *curse* them?

19. *The saints shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air.* Proof: "Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them *in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air*, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." [1 Thess. 4. 17.]

Remarks: Did Titus go up into the clouds literally or figuratively? and did the disciples at the destruction of Jerusalem go up also and meet him in the air and remain there forever with him? The facts and events plainly described in this verse, make the harmony of discord when compared with facts and events as they occurred at the advent of Titus, the Lord of Universalism!

20. *They shall receive a crown of righteousness and glory.* Proof: "Henceforth there is laid up for me *a crown of righteousness*, which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me *at that day*, and not to me only, but unto *all them also* that love his *appearing.*" [2 Tim. 4. 8.] "*When the chief shepherd shall appear*, ye shall receive a *crown of glory* that fadeth not away." [1 Pet. 5. 4.]

*Remarks:* Paul did not receive a crown of righteousness at the ap-

vent of Titus; for he *died* several years before that circumstance occurred; yet he is certainly to receive his crown at the day of Christ's *appearing*, which proves that it will not be till the resurrection of the dead! But the apostle testifies that the *crown* was not only for him, but for "*all them also that love his appearing!*" How about the apostle James, whom Herod slew with a sword; and thousands of the saints who were persecuted to death long before the destruction of Jerusalem? Did they receive a *crown of glory* at the appearing of Titus? How about all the faithful servants of Christ who have lived since Jerusalem was destroyed? They certainly *loved his appearing:* and did all the righteous who are *now living*, who certainly look and hope for his appearing, receive a crown of righteousness at the devastation of the Jewish capital? Did Universalists receive their crown of glory at that time? If not, they are compelled to acknowledge that they do not love the appearing of Christ; or else forever abandon the ridiculous notion of the second advent of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem!

21. *The wicked shall be punished with an everlasting destruction.* Proof: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with an *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." [2 Thess. 1. 7–9.] "Then shall he say also to them on the left hand depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels." [Math. 25. 41.] "These shall go away into *everlasting punishment.*" [Ibid. 46.]

Remarks: Universalists contend that by the banishment of the wicked from the *presence of the Lord* is to be understood the banishment of the Jews from the *temple* in Jerusalem at the time it was beseiged by the Romans! Again: the wicked being driven away "into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the *devil and his angels;*" means the fire that was kindled in Jerusalem at its besiegement, prepared for the *high priest* and his *emissaries!* Very well: when the Lord said "*come ye blessed,*" he meant as a matter of course, come into the presence of Titus, that is, at the burning temple,—the *everlasting fire!* And when the wicked were commanded to depart from his presence, it signifies that they were to be driven away from this everlasting fire, and from the presence of Titus, the representative of the Lord! Universalists appear to think that because the 24th of Matthew refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, therefore every passage in the new Testament which speaks of destruction, or punishment, or the Lord's coming, must necessarily refer to the same thing! This is truly a strange mode of reasoning, fully as illogical and unscriptural as it would be to contend that because Is. 2. 3. refers to the day of pentecost, therefore every prophecy in the old Testament *relates to the same day.* Why should the apostles, in addressing

churches, and brethren among the Gentiles, at more than a thousand miles distance from the land of Judea, threaten the disobedient with the destruction of Jerusalem? Such was the case, according to Universalism, with the Thessalonians. They lived eleven hundred miles from Jerusalem; and yet Paul threatened those who troubled the saints with an everlasting destruction and banishment from the *temple* when Titus came to besiege Jerusalem! This is about as beautiful an idea, as for a man to go and preach to the Canadians, and warn every man night and day with tears to prepare themselves, for in about forty years there is to be an awful explosion of lava from the crater of Mt. Vesuvius! If I only possessed the power to make this thing appear as ridiculous as it really is, there is not a Universalist in existence who would not blush for shame and abandon the absurd doctrine forever. I know it is contended that those who troubled the brethern at Thessalcnica were the Jews, and that in all probability they would be in Jerusalem at the time it was destroyed. But this is all a mistake. It was, the Gentiles, their own *countrymen*, by whom they were *troubled*. Proof: "For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus; for *ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen*, even as they have of the *Jews*." [1 Thess. 2. 14.] But the punishment of the wicked which is to take place at the coming of Christ cannot possibly refer to the tribulation of the Jews at the destruction of their city, for in the next chapter, as we have seen, Paul puts that day a great ways off; but speaks of the Jews in the *present tense*: "The *wrath is come upon them to the uttermost*." [1 Thess. 2. 16.] But since the Gentile disciples at Thessalonica were to be gathered to Christ at the time he appeared to destroy the wicked; it follows that he did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem; for there is not the tenth part of one probability in ten million that all the disciples were taken eleven hundred miles from Thessalonica and gathered around Titus!

22, *The earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up.* Proof: "But the *day of the Lord* will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein, *shall be burned up*." (2 Pet. 3. 10.)

Remarks: Universalists inform us that this is all figurative, and has reference to the passing away of the old Jewish dispensation. But it is a little strange, to say the least, how a dispensation could burn up; and how the *elements* of that dispensation could melt with fervent heat! But it is even stranger still, how the Mosaic dispensation could be annulled and destroyed by Titus, thirty-seven years after having been abrogated by the death of Christ! (See Eph. 2. 14, 15. Col. 2. 14. Gal. 3. 19, 24. Heb. 9. 26.) You can see that Universalists find no difficulty in making anything metaphorical which, like the *above text*, comes in direct contradiction to their theory

though anything is most intensely literal that seems to favor it! But they say it is unreasonable and absurd, to give Peter's language a literal application, for more then two-thirds of the earth is water: how can water burn? This is exceedingly unaccountable to a Universalist; yet he can swallow the idea without difficulty, that a dispensation could *take fire, melt with fervent heat, be dissolved and burn up!* But we are prepared to show that a literal interpretation of Peter's language is every way reasonable and consistent. Science informs us that water is composed of two gases, hydrogen and oxygen, which, when separated, will take fire as quick as powder. Why may not God, by his Almighty fiat, decompose these gases, and make them serve as kindling material with which to start the conflagration of the Universe? Could not every grain of dust, by the decree of Almighty power, be turned into powder as easily as to be turned into living insects, as was the case in one of the ten plagues of Egypt? Upon the same principle, rocks and mountains could be changed to enormous masses of brimstone, and all uniting make up that grand and eternal explosion which, as predicted, is to wrap this earth in one convolving sheet of flame! Here, then, is nothing unreasonable, whilst every thing in connection with this subject proves it to be literal, and that the coming of the Lord in connection with this wonderful event is yet future!

23. *There shall be new heavens, and a new earth.* Proof: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for *new heavens and a new earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. 3. 13.)

Remarks: This too, is all figurative, according to Universalism. It signifies a new dispensation, and a new order of things, which was brought about at the destruction of Jerusalem. But, it is "according to his *promise*." How happens it, that a *promise* of God is all figurative in one case, but when the advocates of this doctrine come to the *promise* made to Abraham,—or some other *promise*, which they fancy leans toward Universalism; behold! it is as literal as the day is long! If the "*promise*" of new heavens, and a new earth is a figure, I would like to put Universalists to the test to prove that there is a *promise* in the Bible to be understood literally. When they would undertake to show that the promise to Abraham was literal, I could adopt their own logic and prove to a demonstration that it meant directly the opposite of what it said by making it figurative, and thus instead of *all nations* being *blessed*, it might signify a *curse*, or something as bad! Query: If the events spoken of in this text relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, and if, since that period, we have enjoyed the new *heavens* and the new *earth* wherein dwells *righteousness;* what think you must have been the *old* heavens and the *old* earth wherein *sin* dwelt?

24. *Christ shall deliver up the mediatorial reign.* Proof: "Christ *the first fruits*, afterwards they that are Christ's at his *com-*

*ing; then* cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God even the Father." (1 Cor. 15. 23, 24.)

Remarks: When Christ had completed his first coming, he took the mediatorial reign; and at his second coming he will deiver it up to the Father. Now if Christ came the second time at the siege of Jerusalem, he *there* and *then* delivered up the mediatorship, and *all flesh* since that time has died and gone into eternity without the least assurance of being saved since no one can be saved without a mediator; for plainly, where there is no *mediation* there can be no *salvation!* Thus these latter-day scoffers who say "where is the promise of his coming," instead of holding out a universal salvation come altogether nearer a universal damnation, when their proclamation of glad tidings is once presented in its true proportions.

25. *When he comes, he shall destroy death.* Proof; "For *he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet;* the last enemy that shall be *destroyed is death.*" (1 Cor. 15, 25, 26.)

Remarks: This caps the climax, and crowns the cap. Christ is to reign as mediator until he comes to make up his jewels, and to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father; but that which shall wind up the drama and close the scene, is the utter destruction of *death.* This cannot be until all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and come forth, and until the dead small and great shall stand before God. Will Universalists still insist that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem? that he delivered up the mediatorial kingdom there, that he raised the dead and *destroyed death?* If not, then they must give up Universalism, for there is not a candid Universalist living who is well posted, who would not at once admit the doctrine false if the second coming of Christ was not accomplished at the destruction of Jerusalem as they have always claimed. We appeal, therefore, to every candid believer of that doctrine, and ask the most searching criticism of the foregoing arguments, involving as they do the obvious and common-sense meaning of the various passages of scripture examined?

## SYNOPSIS OF THE FOREGOING CHAPTER.

"*I will Come Again.*"—John 14. 3.

1. Our Saviour once more upon earth shall appear,
In person as lit'ral as when he was here;
The clouds are his chariot, and glory his throne;
Whilst myriads of angels his majesty own.

2. Ten thousand bright saints with the Lord shall descend,
Their strains of hosannas the heavens shall rend:
Whilst the angels who sung the glad song of his Birth,
Shall gather his saints from the ends of the earth.

3. The kingdom shall come, and the graves shall give way,
And his saints be redeem'd from their prison of clay;
For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall come forth,
From the east, from the west, from the south, from the north.

4. All the nations of men are before him conveyed,
His bar of tribunal in justice arrayed;
Each tongue shall confess, whilst the Judge on the throne,
Shall the wicked condemn, and acknowledge his own.

5. Each eye shall behold him, in awful attire,
The saints shall be glad, and their Saviour admire;
Whilst those who condemn him to die on the tree,
Shall wail, when that glorious Messiah they see.

6. 'Twill comfort the saints to reflect on the day,
When sorrow and sighing shall vanish away:
When they shall be crown'd, and ascend to the skies,
And all tears shall forever be wiped from their eyes.

7. These bodies, though vile, shall be fashioned aright,
And robed in a costume of glory and light;
With songs of thanksgiving, we'll rise in the air,
And dwell with our Saviour eternally there.

8. The world shall be burned, and all Nature dissolve,
And the earth on its axis shall cease to revolve;
Whilst the heavens roll'd up, shall depart as a scroll,
And the stars into regions of darkness shall fall.

9. Creation, convulsed to her centre, shall quake,
At his voice the foundations of heaven will shake;
The sun and the moon shall grow dim and decay,
And the earth, from his presence, shall vanish away.

10. But celestial heavens and earth shall be made,
All garnished with glory, that never shall fade;
The redeemed shall rejoice in that blissful abode,
Where sorrow shall never their pleasure corrode.

11. Unpolluted by sin, and unhurt by disease,
With their ensign of triumph, unfurl'd in the breeze;
A crown of bright glory they ever shall wear,
And palm-wreaths of honor, triumphantly bear!

12. A convoy of angels, and chariot of love,
Shall escort them safe home to that city above;
Transform'd like the Saviour, secure from all pain,
In his glorified presence, forever to reign!

13. But the wicked shall sink into darkness and gloom,
Everlasting destruction,—their sentence and doom;
From the presence of God and the Lamb they shall flee,
And the glory of heaven they never shall see!

14. The remedial kingdom shall come to an end,
And the sceptre of pardon—no longer extend;
*Death spoil'd of his* trophies, all vanquish'd shall fall,
*The saints saved in heaven*, and *God all in all.*

## CHAPTER III.

### THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

*"The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."*—John 5. 22.

Universalists have two theories with respect to the day of Judgment; so that when one gives way the other is resorted to as the only true ground upon this subject. At one time they will claim that the destruction of Jerusalem was the day of Judgment spoken of in the scriptures; but when driven from this position they lay claim to the whole *Christian dispensation* as that day, and contend that men are *judged, condemned,* and *punished* every day as they go along. Hence we know not just how to take them or where to find them. But in the first place let us proceed to examine the texts of scripture relied upon as proof in favor of either of the above positions.

"And Jesus said: *for judgment* am I come into this world." [John 9. 39.] The word *judgment,* as used in the scriptures, does not always have the same meaning. Of this fact Universalists appear to make no note. They argue as though this text and every other in the Bible, which speak of *judgment,* have reference to moral character and the execution of divine penalty on account of sin. The context, however, must explain all such applications of the term. The text above quoted manifestly has reference to another subject altogether, as the remainder of that verse will prove. "For judgment am I come into this world, that *they which see not might see,* and that they which see, might be made blind." Christ had just performed a miracle in opening the eyes of a blind man; and he has reference only to such displays of miraculous power in attestation of his Messiahship; and for such miraculous "*judgment*" did Christ come into the world;—to prove that he was really "the Christ, the Son of God," that men might *judge,* or form *judgment* concerning him. But Universalists contradict themselves by claiming as they do that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem to judge the world; and then immediately quoting the language of Christ to prove that he came the first time for that very purpose! They not only contradict themselves, but they make Christ contradict himself by first teaching that he came to judge the world (as Universalists interpret his language,) and then affirming, as he does, in John 12. 47: "*I came not to judge the world.*" Universalists cannot reconcile this discrepancy by their mode of interpretation, which is only a sample of the havock they are continually making with the Bible.

But they quote another text: "*Now is the judgment of this world.*" [John 12. 31.] Their exposition of this language would present the same contradictions as stated above. Hence, let it mean what it may, it cannot signify what they say it does. But Christ speaks immediately after concerning his own death; and it is most probable he refers to the unrighteous *judgment* pronounced against him by the chief priests, which he designates as "the *judgment* of this world;" for then was fulfilled the prediction of Isaiah: "He was taken from prison, and *from judgment.*" [Is. 53. 8.] Let it still be borne in mind that Christ has most distinctly stated, that he did not come the first time "to *judge the world*;" and hence he did not come to *condemn* it; for it would be most unreasonable to condemn men before they were judged. The Saviour bears witness to this and testifies that "God sent not his Son into the world to *condemn* the world, but that the world through him might be saved." [John 3. 17.] And since Christ did not come the first time to *judge* the world, he has therefore reserved that work for his second coming; and as we have most incontrovertibly proved in the preceding chapter, that his second advent is yet future and will be at the resurrection of the dead, it follows just as incontrovertibly that *then* and *there* will be the day of judgment!

But we are referred to 1 Pet. 4. 17: "The time *is come* that judgment must begin at the house of God." This, it is said, proves that *now* is the judgment day, and that *now*, in the Christian dispensation, Christ is judging men according to their deeds. But Universalists forget their criticism about the little word "*one*" in italics in Is. 45. 24! They tell us that such words were supplied by the translators and are not to be found in the original text; and if such words do not make good sense they are not correct, &c. Very good: How about the word "*is come?*" If you turn to King James's translation you will find it in *italics* just like that troublesome word "*one*," which has caused so much sermonizing eloquence. Neither will this phrase, "*is come*," make sense or harmonize with the remainder of the text. "The time *is come* that judgment *must begin.*" Thus we have "*must begin*" in the future, and "*is come*" in the present tense! If the phrase *will come* had been supplied instead of the one employed by the translators, the text would then be consistent with itself. "The time *will come* that judgment *must begin* at the house of God." Both are thus put in the future tense, and the text is not only consistent with itself but, as we shall show, consistent with the whole revelation of God. In connection with the above text is quoted another: "Who shall give account to him that *is ready* to judge the quick and the dead." [1 Pet. 4. 5.] This, however, does not say that Christ *is judging* the quick and the dead; although the Christian dispensation had then been in progress for nearly *thirty* years. This demonstrates that the Christian dispensation is *not the "judgment day."* But he was then ready to judge the liv-

ing and the dead, has been ready ever since, and is now ready; and he will judge them, whenever the *dead* are raised and they, with the *living*, are brought to stand before God.

The fact that he was *ready* to judge them 1800 years ago, is no proof that they were then judged; for, according to Peter's testimony he might be ready during two thousand years, and it would be no longer than two days to him that sitteth upon the throne.

Let us now take a brief glance at the positive Scripture testimony which opposes the doctrine of Universalism.

---

*Twenty-five Incontrovertible Arguments to prove that the Day of Judgment and the final Separation of the Righteous from the Wicked are yet Future, beyond Death, and at the Resurrection of the Dead.*

1. "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed *a day* in which he *will judge* the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." [Ac. 17. 30, 31.]

Remarks: This "*day*," in which God *will judge* the world cannot mean the *Christian dispensation*, for that was then in progress. But this judgment *day* was still future:—"*will judge*," not *is judging*. Again: in this future *day* "*the world*" is to be judged, and Universalists tell us that "*the world*" means the whole human family without exception. (See examination of John 1. 29., Chap. 1.) "*The world*," as Universalists understand it, never was nor ever will be judged in the Christian dispensation until the resurrection of the dead; for more then ten thousand times ten thousand people of *the world* were dead and in their graves before the Christian dispensation had commenced.

But Universalists tell us that Adam died the very *day* he ate of the forbidden fruit; for it is not likely, they tell us, when God laid down the prohibition: "In the *day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," that he used the word "*day*" In any other than the sense understood by Adam, that is, literally. We admit the premises,—that God made use of the word *day* as Adam understood it; but we deny the conclusion,—that Adam actually died the day he partook of the interdicted tree. (See Ezek. 33. 14.) Now let Universalists stand to their own logic and it will be then understood that when God speaks of *a day* in which he will judge the world, he means it to be understood as "*a day*" in the literal sense of that word. Very well, say you, that may all be admitted and yet the *day* in which God was to judge *the world* may have reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. In this, however, you renounce Universalism by admitting that "*the world*" signifies only a few of the Jews, and consequently that Christ's being "the Saviour of the world," as *well as taking* away the sin of *the world* may have reference only to

those who died at the siege of Jerusalem. Thus Universalism is foiled let it take which ground it will. But suppose we examine this Jerusalem dodge and see how it will work along side of this text. "God *commands all men everywhere to repent, because* he has appointed a day in which he will *destroy Jerusalem!*" How does that read? Yes, all the Gentiles,—with those away off in the city of Athens,—they must all repent, for in about twenty years there is to be a disturbance between the Jews and the Romans down yonder in the land of Judea, about twelve or fifteen hundred miles off! What a wonderful inducement this must have been for all men everywhere to repent!

2. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." [2 Cor. 5 10.]

Remarks: This cannot have reference to the Christian dispensation; for Paul speaks in the future tense: "*We must all appear* before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one *may receive.*" Had he referred to the Christian dispensation, he would have expressed himself thus: "We all *now stand* before the judgment seat of Christ, and are every one *receiving every day of our lives as we go along*, according to our deeds." Neither can it refer to the judgment seat of Titus; for Paul, and perhaps a large number of those whom he addressed, were dead and in their graves before Titus made his advent. And if it could be proved that they all lived till Jerusalem was destroyed, still Universalists would have a difficult task to prove that the whole Corinthian church was taken nearly a thousand miles to stand before Titus while he judged the Jews! But Universalists tell us that the words "*done*" and "*his*" in this verse are supplied by the translators; and that the text makes good sense without them. They think by this means they will confine it to the present life. Let us now read it without those supplied words: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ that every one may receive the *things in body* [i. e. all at once,— in a *lump*,] according to that he hath done." Is this the Universalist judgment of receiving a little here and a little there, scattered along through a whole lifetime?

3. "And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come*, Felix trembled." (Acts 24. 25.)

Remarks: This is but another demonstration of the mistake of Universalism in trying to make the Christian dispensation the day of judgment, since notwithstanding the day of judgment had been going on ever since Christ was exalted at the right hand of God, nearly thirty years, still the apostle understood the matter no better than to preach orthodoxy,—that the day of judgment was yet in *the future! But says the* advocate of Universalism, Paul certainly

had reference this time to the destruction of Jerusalem. Let us see: Felix was a Roman governor; and think you that Paul preaching to him about the destruction of Jerusalem would make him tremble? Is it at all likely that a Roman governor would be very much alarmed to be informed that his own countrymen were to obtain a signal victory over their enemies, and achieve a most important conquest? Felix might be the very man who would take part in helping to pull down the walls of Jerusalem; yet, when Paul gave him to understand that he with his fellow Roman citizens were going to succeed in achieving such a victory, he was so frightened that he *trembled!* This is among the consistent beauties of Universalism!

4. "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the *day of judgment.*" (Math. 12. 36.)

Remarks: From this also we discover that the day of judgment, when Christ taught the people, was yet in the future. But it may be said that this could be the case and the day of judgment still signify the Christian dispensation; as that did not commence till the day of Pentecost, when Christ entered upon his reign. But was every idle word that was spoken previous to this, brought to an account on that day or on any day or all days since the dispensation of Christ commenced? How about the idle words uttered by Judas at the time he betrayed his Lord? Did he give an account thereof, after the day of Pentecost? Not unless he did it in eternity, and Universalists would not allow that he did that. We shall let the Saviour explain himself fully upon the day of judgment before we close this chapter.

5. "For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful *looking for of judgment* and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." (Heb. 10. 27.) "But after thy hard and impenitent heart, *treasurest up* to thyself wrath *against the day of wrath* and revelation of the *righteous judgment* of God, who *will render* to *every man* according to his works." [Rom. 2. 5, 6.]

Remarks: In the first text we have it declared that the wicked were to *look* for a *judgment* and *fiery indignation* still in the future, notwithstanding the Christian dispensation had commenced more than thirty years before. In the second text the apostle asserts that the wicked were *treasuring up wrath* against some future *day*, when there should be a revelation of the *righteous judgment* of God. This will be hard to make agree with the judgment day of Universalism at the coming of Titus, for it would be folly to suppose that the apostle would threaten the wicked Romans with the destruction of Jerusalem when they were the very men who would destroy it!

6. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be

*reserved unto judgment.*" (2 Pet. 2. 4.) "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.)

Remarks: Were the rebellious angels cast down to hell and reserved unto the destruction of Jerusalem to be punished? I know Universalists contend that these angels were nothing more than wicked men. But Peter, in the same chapter, testifies that *angels* "are greater in power and might" than men; (verse 11,) showing conclusively that he uses the term *angel* not with respect to men here in mortal flesh, but to a higher order of intelligences. But let this be as it may, it affects not the present argument in the least; but admitting them to be men only makes the matter worse for Universalism; for if men, who *had sinned* in the past tense, were then *being reserved* till some future *day*, called the judgment of the *great day*, to be punished; it behooves men now to take heed, lest they fall into the same condemnation. Query: Were those human angels punished for their sins as they went along? or, in other words, was God judging and punishing them, and at the same time *reserving* them *unto* some future *day of judgment to be punished?*

Jude speaks of this as "the judgment of the *great day.*" But it may be asked: Did we not take the ground at the commencement that the *day* of judgment was to be understood literally? We certainly did, and say so still.—But does this not contradict the idea of its being a *great day?* Not at all. It is known to all nations that the fourth day of July among the American people is a *great day.* Not because it is twenty-six hours long, for it is a literal day, and the same as other days in this respect; but it is a *great day*, because upon that *day great transactions* occur. So will it be in the *great day* of God Almighty, when he shall convocate the posterity of Adam into the presence of his awful majesty to know their doom. Such, indeed, will be a great and important transaction, and such can truly be called "the great and terrible day of the Lord?"

7. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die and after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. 9. 27. 28.)

Remarks: Universalists have two ways of interpreting this text to evade its manifest force. We shall examine both. They tell us that "after *this* the judgment," does not mean after *death;* but after *this* appointment! Now if such language as the above text proves that the judgment is before death, than I have lost all idea, or never had any, of the correct combination of words into sentences. Let us look at a few grammatical parallels which will probably explain this: It is appointed unto a man once to die and after this the funeral: that is, according to Universalism, after this appointment the funeral! In other words, he must have his funeral sermon *preached before he dies!* Again: It is appointed unto men once to

die, and after this be buried: that is, after *this* appointment, but he must be buried before death! Once more: It is appointed unto men once to die and after this the resurrection: that is, after this *appointment* the resurrection! In other words, men will be raised from the dead before they die! This is sufficient for such a criticism. But why this objection if we should say "*after death*" instead of "*after this*?" Suppose the text did really read, "after *death* the judgment," Universalists could dispose of it in the same manner as they do scores of other texts as emphatic as this: that is, make it figurative: *death* is to be understood merely in a moral sense!

But now for the other exposition. We are told that *tois anthropois*, here translated *men*, should have been rendered *these men*, meaning the Jewish high priests who, by going into the holiest of holies *died typically*, and after this came out and judged them! We will now present several reasons why *tois anthropois* does not and cannot mean the Jewish high priests.

1. *Tois anthropois* should not be translated *these men*, or *those men* as Universalists contend, for in all their efforts to give it this signification they have never brought forward one example where the word is thus translated. This proves that no such example is to be found; for if such a text existed they would most unquestionably have adduced it.

2. The *dying* here spoken of was not figurative or else Christ *died* nothing but a figurative death; for the text reads: "*So* Christ was once offered," that is in like manner; and if it was only figurative, then he was not a real but a figurative sacrifice,—made nothing but a figurative atonement, and man at most can have nothing more than a figurative salvation through him! But if Christ died a literal death, then the death of the *tois anthropois* was also literal; which proves that it does not signify the high priest in the holy place who certainly did not die; for the Lord laid down this law: "And it shall be upon Aaron to minister; and his sound shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place before the Lord and when he cometh out, *that he die not.*" [Ex. 28. 35.]

3. The high priest going through the blue veil of the temple into the holy place was not typical of death, but typified exactly the opposite of death, as it was a type of Christ entering through the blue veil,—the cerulean curtain of the skies,—into the realm of an "*endless life.*" What death did Christ die after he had entered into the true holy place? Thus the high priest entered into a typical *life*, which breaks down Universalism upon this subject.

4. If the high priest *going into* the most holy place was the dying here referred to then the apostle was sadly mistaken; for instead of its being appointed unto *these* men *once* to die, they had to die every year, for Paul declares: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing

the service of God; but into the *second* [the most holy place] went the high priest alone *once every year.*" [Heb. 9. 6. 7.] Hence it cannot mean the typical death of the high priest any way it can be construed, for instead of dying *once*, as the text declares, by the time he was sixty years old he had died *thirty times.*

5. This text cannot have reference to the Jewish high priests; for after he came out of the holy place, instead of *judging* the people he *blessed* them. Thus we read: "And Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people, and *blessed* them, and came down from offering of the sin offering,—and Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out and *blessed* the people." [Lev. 9. 22, 23.] But Universalists contend that the word *blessing* signifies *judgment.* Let us now try their own definition for example, with the promise to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be *judged.*" If a *general or universal judgment* be the *blessing* included in the promise to Abraham then the orthodox would have no objection to Universalists making all the capital out of that promise they can!

6. If a *typical death* is what we are to understand by the text, then *tois anthropois* more properly signifies the animals that were slain outside of the camp; for their death typified the death of Christ outside of the gates of Jerusalem.—Hence, instead of saying "*men*," as the apostle does, he should have said: "It is appointed unto *bullocks once to die*, and after this be sacrificed." Universalists are bound to admit that this exposition is far preferable to theirs, and that it comes much nearer the truth.

7. Universalists make much ado if any one should happen to quote the text in this way: "It is appointed unto *all men* once to die and after this the judgment." But it can be demonstrated to be the true meaning of the text. Turn to your Bible, and read Acts 17. 30: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commands *all men everywhere* to repent;" and then turn to your Greek Testament, and you will there find that very same word, *tois anthropois.* Let us now read the text in Heb. 9. 27 in this way, and we have the true idea of the passage: "It is appointed unto *all men everywhere* once to die, and after this the judgment!" We hope Universalists will now be satisfied, and that we shall hear no more about *tois anthropois*, and the Jewish high priests!

8. "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store reserved unto fire, *against the day of judgment*, and the *perdition of ungodly men.*" [2 Pet. 3. 7.]

Remarks: This text is most clear and emphatic, in pointing out the day of judgment, and the perdition of ungodly men, not only as still future, but simultaneous with the end of time, and the dissolution of this earth by fire. The only way in which Universalists have *ever tried* to evade this most sweeping declaration, is by taking the *ground that it is a figurative* representation of the destruction of the

Jewish dispensation at the downfall of Jerusalem. They say it is inconsistent to suppose that this earth will ever be on fire literally as here described by the apostle; notwithstanding it is perfectly natural, it would seem, for a dispensation to *melt* and *burn up!* They argue, also, that there was a day of judgment at the close of the antediluvian age, when the wicked were destroyed by the flood: —that there was also a judgment at the conclusion of the dispensation before the law, when the wicked Egyptians were destroyed in the Red Sea; and that there should be a day of judgment at the breaking up of the Jewish economy. This is all reasonable, and consistent, we freely admit, and with a very little modification is the true state of the case; and this being so, we ask where is the impropriety of there being a day of general judgment at the closing up of the Christian dispensation? Why should the Christian age differ from all others? Universalists are compelled to admit upon the principles of consistency that there will be a general judgment at the close of this dispensation! But the judgment at the flood, at the Red Sea, and at the destruction of Jerusalem, were all temporal judgments. and never spoken of as "*the day of judgment*," once in the whole Bible.

Let us now inquire if the earth, which is to be renovated by fire at the day of judgment, is to be understood literally, or as having reference only to an age or dispensation. Universalists acknowledge that the earth was literally deluged with water; and we have an abundance of testimony to prove that it underwent some change or transformation, which was considered a *destruction* at that great cataclysm. Peter says it "*perished*," and God said to Noah: "I will establish my covenant with you, neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood, neither shall there any more be a flood to *destroy the earth*." [Gen. 9. 11.] Peter keeps up the contrast between the earth that then was, and the earth that is now; one being literally deluged and renovated by water; and the other being destined to be as literally deluged and renovated, or regenerated by fire: for God declares: "Behold I make *all things new*." [Rev. 21. 5.] This old earth, or the earth in its old sin-worn and sin-poluted state, is to pass away. God said to Noah: "While the *earth remaineth;*" [Gen. 8. 22.] showing plainly that it was not always to remain. Christ also testifies: "Verily I say unto you: *till heaven and earth pass.*" [Math. 5. 18.] This shows that there will be a time when heaven and earth shall *pass*. Again: "*Heaven and earth shall pass away*, but my words shall not pass away." [Math. 24. 35.] Paul, however, puts the question forever at rest, and shows that the heavens and the earth, which are to be destroyed and pass away, must be understood literally, as meaning this physical Universe which God has created. "And thou Lord in the *beginning* hast laid the *foundation of the earth;* and the *heavens* are the *works of thy hands;* they shall *perish* but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a

garment; and as a vesture shalt thou *fold them up*, and *they shall be changed.*" [Heb. 1. 10-12.] This proves that the literal earth which we now inhabit, the foundations of which God laid in the *beginning*, is to be *destroyed* and *changed:* and when can this take place but at the time marked out by Peter,—the day of judgment, and the perdition of ungodly men? The candid and intelligent reader must decide for himself.

9. "And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked,—the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the *unjust* unto the *day of judgment to be punished*" [2 Pet. 2. 7. 9.]

Remarks: The certainty of a future judgment at the resurrection of the dead, is so clearly sustained from this text that it needs not a comment. The Sodomites, the very characters who vexed the soul of righteous Lot with their unlawful deeds, are now being reserved to some future *day of judgment* to be punished; which plainly cannot be until the Sodomites are raised from the dead.— How will Universalists reconcile this with their theory that men receive in full for their sins every day as they go along? Does God reserve men till some future day to be punished, and punish them all the while he is reserving them and as much as they deserve? But we have another text which will confirm this, and dispel all doubt concerning its reference to the future.

10. "Woe unto thee Chorazin, woe unto thee Bethsadia,—it *shall be* more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the *day of judgment* than for you. And thou Capernium which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell;—it *shall be* more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the *day of judgment* than for thee." [Math. 11. 21-24.]

Remarks: The plain, unvarnished and unsophistical force of this text defies the ingenuity of Universalism. It is here most unequivocally stated, that the men of Tyre, Sidon and Sodom, are all to be in the day of judgment still in the future. These characters were all dead hundreds of years before Christ made this statement; yet they "*shall be*" in some future *day of judgment* with the people of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernium. Was this at the destruction of Jerusalem? No one can believe such a thing. But Universalists try to make out that the Sodomites will be raised holy and happy by appealing to the prophesy of Ezekiel. The following language is quoted in proof of the above position. "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of *Sodom* and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them:—When thy sisters Sodom and her daughters shall return to their former estate; and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate; then thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate.—And I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I *am the Lord:* That thou mayest remember, and be confounded,

and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am *pacified* toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God." [Ezek. 16. 53, 55, 62, 63.] Here then is the testimony in favor of the Sodomites at the resurrection of the dead. But how did Universalists happen to know that this was all literal? This is indeed a mystery, but it is easily solved, for they thought it favored Universalism, and therefore *must be literal!* But had the word *damnation, hell* or *judgment* happened to occur in this connection, the whole matter would have been immediately converted in a cluster of rhetorical figures!

Now just to accommodate the doctrine we will admit the whole representation to be literal, although there is as much reason for a metaphorical sense as for any other prediction in the Bible. The text declares, that "Sodom and her daughters shall return to their *former estate*," as Universalists understand it, at the resurrection. This prove that they will be *sinful* and *miserable* in the resurrection for such they were, and such was their *former estate* before they were destroyed! Again the text reads, "that thou mayest remember and *be confounded*," and that too in the resurrection! Are they to be *believers* and at the same time be *confounded?* No, for Peter says: "He that believeth on him [Christ] shall not be confounded." [1 Pet. 2, 6.] Then they are unbelievers in the resurrection state and consequently condemned, for "He that believeth not is condemned already." (John 3. 18.) But the text also says they are to be *ashamed*, and hence they are not the people of God, for God says: "My people shall *never be ashamed.*" (Joel 2. 26.) But worse and worse: The text declares, that they shall "never open their mouths *any more.*" Is this the way Universalists intend to sing the songs of Zion by never opening their mouths *any more?* How long is "any more!" You remember the Universalist text in Luke 20. 36. "Neither can they die *any more;*" that is, they can not die to all eternity! From thus we come at an idea of what the Universalist salvation of the Sodomites will consist in. They will not be the people of God, for they will be *ashamed*,—they will be *confounded*,—they will be *condemned*, and they will have to keep their mouths shut eternally! So much for the literal teaching of the text.

But what is to be done with this? God says he is to be *pacified* toward them. Let us inquire, what is meant by the word pacify? Universalists say it means to be reconciled. It occurs in only one other place in the Bible, and that is Est. 7. 10. "So they hanged Haman on the gallows that he had prepared for Mordecai. Then was the king's wrath *pacified.*" Thus may God be *pacified* towards the Sodomites after the resurrection, when he has *confounded, condemned*, and sentenced them eternally to shut their mouths!

11. "The men of Nineveh shall *rise in judgment* with this generation and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching *of Jonah;* and behold a greater than Jonah is here. The

queen of the South shall *rise up in judgment* with this generation and shall condemn it, for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold a greater than Solomon is here." [Math. 12. 41, 42.]

Remarks: If this does not prove a day of judgment at the resurrection, then it is not in the power of language to express such a sentiment. The men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba, although having been dead and in their graves for hundreds of years, are to be judged in the future; for the Saviour points still to the future, and declares that they "*shall rise up in judgment.*" When can this be but at the resurrection? Mark the word "*rise up;*" *egersis* in the Greek, and the precise word employed by the apostle in the 15th of 1st Cor. which as Universalists acknowledge, refers to the literal resurrection of the dead. Thus we have it incontrovertibly established that in the literal resurrection the men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba shall *rise up in judgment.* It is difficult to see how a Universalist would attempt to evade this testimony.

12. "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law in *the day* when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." [Rom. 2. 12, 16.]

Remarks: I have quoted the connection by leaving out the parenthesis. This text informs us, that "*as many,* [i. e. *all*] that have sinned in the law [including as a matter of course those who sinned and fell in the wilderness] *shall be judged* by the law." This teaches unequivocally that those who had sinned in the law, and had been dead for more than a thousand years, were still to be judged in some *future day,* which cannot be till the resurrection when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ *according to the gospel.* This is the same *day* which God has appointed, "in the which he *will judge the world* in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." Does this relate to the destruction of Jerusalem? Surely not; for those dead sinners were not raised at that time to be judged; neither were those who were present on that occasion judged according to the *gospel,* but according to the law of Moses. (Read Deu. 28.) Hence it is incontrovertible that the day of judgment is still future, and will not take place till the *dead are raised.*

13. "I saw the dead, both small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works; and death and hell were cast *into the lake of fire;* this is the second death." [Rev. 20, 12–14.]

*Remarks.* Universalists do not pretend to reconcile this text with

their doctrine. They do, however, try to evade its force by resorting to their old assumption of *figure, allegory, metaphor*, etc. They try to make this out a figurative representation of things which belong exclusively to this world, from the fact that this punishment is to continue "*day and night* forever and ever." (Verse 10.) But how happens it that "*day and night*" is to be understood *literally* all at once, whilst the whole connection is figurative? This is one of the marvellous things of Universalism! As they admit the phrase "day and night" to be literal, it will puzzle them to prove that the *judgment* of the dead both small and great, is a figure! We are frequently told that the phrase "day and night" cannot refer to the state beyond the resurrection. Well let us see. The *Pro* and *Con* of Universalism, by George Rogers, a prominent expounder of that faith, on page 106, quotes Rev. 7. 9, and applies it to the resurrection state. "And after this I beheld and lo a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, *clothed with white robes* and palms in their hands." This, let it be remembered is quoted to prove that after the resurrection all mankind are to be saved; for they shall wear "*white robes*," &c. It does not however teach this doctrine, although we admit with Mr. Rogers that it refers to the *post*-resurrection state; for mark the fact, it was not all kindreds, people, tongues, &c., but it was "a great multitude *of* all nations, and kindred, and people, and tongues," which makes the matter widely different. But let us read on concerning this great multitude. "And one of the elders answered saying unto me, what are these which are arrayed in *white robes*, and whence come they? And I said, sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, these are they which come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb: therefore are they before the throne of God, *and serve him day and night in his temple.*" (Ibid. 15–17.) Here then Universalists have to admit, that "day and night" in the Revelations may and actually does apply to the eternal state! But if this judgment scene, being measured by words strictly applicable only to time is a proof that it is confined to this world, then upon the same principle, the existence of God will end with the history of time; for it is said concerning him: "Thou art the same, and thy *years* shall not fail." (Heb. 1. 12,) But again, we have the testimony of the same *Pro* and *Con*, proving to an absolute certainty that this scene of judgment, described by the Revelator, refers to the resurrection state. We shall give a quotation from page 119.

"Hell is fated to the same end [i. e. destruction.] God says by the prophet, 'I will ransom them from the power of *sheol* (grave or hell;), I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues. O sheol, I will be thy destruction.' (Hos. 13. 14.) John's description (highly figurative unquestionably) must refer to the same

*event.* 'And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire: this is the second death.' Here the destruction of death itself is termed the second death."

Very good, Mr. Rogers: you admit then, do you, that when men shall be delivered from the power of the grave, and when *death* shall be destroyed, then and there will be the lake of fire and brimstone described by the Revelator? Yes you do. And you have not forgotten your favorite text—1. Cor. 15. 26, which also declares that death, the last enemy, "*shall be destroyed*" at the resurrection which you admit to be yet future! Now since the lake of fire is to be at the resurrection of the dead, we shall let John tell what else besides death and hades is to be cast into it, at that time. If part of his testimony upon this subject be taken, we are bound to take all. "And *whosoever* was not found written in the *book of life* was cast into the lake of fire" (verse 15,) *at the resurrection of the dead* of course! Again: "But the *fearful*, and *unbelieving*, and the *abominable*, and *murderers*, and *whoremongers*, and *sorcerers*, and *idolaters*, and *all liars*, shall have their part in *the lake* which burneth with fire and brimstone *which is the second death.*" (Rev. 21. 8.) And all too, at the *resurrection;* for so testifies Paul, so testifies John and so testifies the Rev. George Rogers! And it must be true; for "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established." (2 Cor. 13. 1.)

14. "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust; and *herein* do I *exercise myself*, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men." [Acts 24. 15, 16.]

Remarks: Universalists never quote verse 16, for that appears to favor the idea that Paul *exercised himself*, and cultivated his character with direct reference to this general resurrection of which he speaks: Hence this much of Paul's testimony must be kept in the back ground. Universalists admit, without hesitation, that this text relates to the same resurrection upon which Paul treats in 1 Cor. 15. But they insist that the text does not teach that men will be *unjust* when they are raised: for Paul, they say, must have possessed the spirit of a demon to hope for the resurrection of men to damnation! But Universalists claim that Paul hoped, and exhorted the disciples to hope, for the coming of the Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem to massacre the Jews by thousands; and yet it would be inconsistent for Paul to hope for the resurrection of the wicked to simple justice! But the truth is, every righteous man must hope and desire that justice and righteousness will be done if it should even consist in the resurrection of the wicked to eternal punishment. Like the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness *of Jesus,* crying under the alter: "How long, O Lord, holy and *true, dost thou not judge* and avenge our blood on them that dwell

on the earth?" [Rev. 6. 10.] God has said, in many places, that he will raise the wicked to damnation; and the Judge of all the earth will do right. Now cannot a Christian consistently hope for God to do what is right? If he can then he can with all propriety hope for the resurrection of the unjust to condemnation, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. And God would not say he would do a thing that was wrong. But Universalists have a similitude which, like their exposition of *tois anthropois*, has gone the rounds, and is in the mouth of every advocate of the doctrine. Suppose, say they I should hope for the resurrection of all the Methodists and Presbyterians in this house, would it follow that I hoped they would be raised Methodists and Presbyterians? or that they would continue thus after they were raised? I answer no. But the case is not at all parallel. Paul hoped, not for the resurrection of the just and of the unjust who were alive; but for the resurrection of the *dead* both *just* and *unjust*. This proves that they remain *just* and *unjust* after *death*; and that the same distinction is kept up after men leave this world that exists before it. Now suppose it to be a fact, that men do actually remain Methodists and Presbyterians after they die, the same as they are now; and a man should hope for a resurrection of the *dead* both Methodists and Presbyterians, would it not be perfectly natural and consistent to infer from his language, that he expected them to be Methodists and Presbyterians at the resurrection as much as before it? Most certainly. Now since Universalists freely admit the resurrection of the *just* as well as of the *unjust* to be literal, let us ask whether there will be any distinction at that time between the righteous and the wicked? "Thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just.*" [Luke 14. 14.] Thus at the resurrection of the *just*, the righteous shall be rewarded for their deeds in this life, and upon the same principle, at the resurrection of the *unjust* the wicked will receive their condemnation!

The whole Bible carries out the same distinction as existing between saints and sinners, between *just* and *unjust*, after death as before it. When Christ arose, we are informed that "the graves were opened, and many bodies of the *saints* which slept arose." [Math. 27. 52.] If there is no difference after death between *saints* and those *who die in their sins*, why this partiality toward the dead saints at the time of Christ's resurrection? Why not on this occasion have raised the bodies of the wicked as well as of the righteous, and thus have demonstrated the truth of Universalism? How easy this would have been; but Universalism was not true, and hence, none of the wicked arose in consequence of the glorious resurrection of the Son of God, proving that the same distinction exists between saints and sinners both here and hereafter.

15. "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, *let us go on* to perfection; not laying again the foundation

of repentance from dead works and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of *resurrection of the dead* and of *eternal judgment.*" [Heb. 6. 1–3.]

Remarks: What testimony could be more positive than this that the day of judgment is beyond the resurrection? If the idea could be conveyed in language more definite and unequivocal, I should be extremely curious to know how it would be shaped. The apostle here informs us that one of the principles of the gospel is the *resurrection of the dead*, and the one immediately following this is the "*eternal judgment.*" This cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem for two reasons: 1. The dead were not *raised* at that time, but right the opposite,—many thousands having been killed; and 2. The calamity brought upon the Jewish nation, was not an *eternal judgment*, but the whole affair was of a temporal and limited character. But this *eternal judgment* must necessarily belong to the *eternal state* of existence; and hence, as the apostle here affirms, it will and must take place subsequently to the *resurrection of the dead!* This however is but a fraction of the evidence we have yet to adduce.

16. "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all *stand* before the *judgment seat of Christ:* for it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." [Rom. 14. 10 11.]

Remarks: This language was written many years after the Christian dispensation had commenced, and the apostle still speaks of the appearing before the judgment seat of Christ as being future. Neither can it mean the destruction of Jerusalem. For all the saints at Rome were certainly not taken seventeen hundred miles to appear before Titus at his contest with the Jews! And moreover, Paul (as was unquestionably the case with many addressed at that time,) was dead and his in grave before the judgment seat of Titus was erected. But Universalists themselves shall now decide as to what period the apostle here refers. The reader will recollect that Is. 45. 23, is quoted by Universalists as evidence that the whole human family will be saved at the resurrection; because *there* and *then* "every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess!" This text is thus quoted and thus applied by every Universalist clergyman in the country. Then notice this most unanswerable fact, that Paul quotes the same text precisely which Universalists apply to the resurrection, and proves by it that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ at the very time when this *bowing* and *confessing* shall take place! This settles the question with Universalism, and its advocates are compelled from their own premises to admit the *judgment seat of Christ* to be at *the resurrection of the dead!* A *more startling* instance of Universalism against itself could not be *desired.*

17. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" [Math. 23. 33.]

Remarks: The only way in which Universalists have tried to evade this text as teaching a future retribution, is by contending that the word *gehenna*, here translated hell, literally signifies the valley of *Hinnom* a short distance from Jerusalem; and that the Saviour makes use of the word in that sense.

Let us now inquire into the meaning of this word, as employed by the Saviour. The fact that Christ threatened the scribes and pharisees with the damnation of hell, proves that they were liable to this damnation; for, to say that he would threaten men with something of which they were in no possible danger, would be to charge the Lord with folly and deception. This being so, then the word *hell* does not mean the valley of *Hinnom* for of this the scribes and pharisees were in no danger. But suppose this was the meaning of the threat, who was there to inflict this punishment? Was Christ to throw them into the valley of Hinnom? No; for he says: "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save them." [Luke 9. 56.] Did Christ mean that the apostles would inflict this punishment? No, for he commands them to "resist not evil," and "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them." [Math. 5. 39; 7. 12.] Now the disciples would not wish men to throw them into the valley of *Hinnom;* and hence they would not do so to them according to this golden rule. Neither *could* they, had they been so disposed; for that punishment belonged exclusively to the civil authority. Consequently, if that punishment be inflicted at all, it would have to be done by the Jews who were at the head of the government. But who were these Jews? They were these very scribes and pharisees whom Christ threatened with the damnation of this valley of *Gehenna* which they had the exclusive control of! Is it very likely that they would inflict this punishment upon themselves? If they would not then there was nobody else that could; and hence the *damnation of hell*, of which the scribes and pharisees were in danger, was not the valley of Hinnom! When Christ put the question to them: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" they might have replied had they understood him the way Universalists now do: We can escape it easily enough; for this hell of which you speak we have in our own hands, and we were never in the least danger of it; neither would we punish anybody with the damnation of *our hell* for the offences you speak of, for we, ourselves, are the very men who have committed those offences! There would be more propriety, they might have retorted, in letting your inquiry be directed to your disciples,—how can *you* escape the damnation of hell? for they might be the very first candidates for this punishment. But be assured that we shall not hurt any man with the fires of Hinnom, much less ourselves,

for disobeying your word! Such would undoubtedly have been the reply of the pharisees, if Christ had reference to the valley of Hinnom. Hence, that cannot be the *hell* here threatened. But suppose the Lord meant: How can you escape the *destruction of Jerusalem?* The pharisees might have replied: Why, easily enough, by dying and going to heaven before that occurs! How completely would a Universalist have confounded the Lord had he been in the place of one of those scribes, that is, if Christ really taught Universalism! But suppose the Saviour meant: How can you escape the damnation of a guilty conscience? They might have replied by sinning ahead as hard as we can, until our "consciences are seared with a hot iron," and till we thus get "past feeling!"

From the foregoing, we consider the point incontrovertibly established, that the *damnation of hell* does not, and cannot refer to any punishment to be inflicted in this life; and must consequently refer to the future state of existence! But we shall now introduce another argument which stands very immediately connected with this which must, in the mind of every candid reader, remove the last vestige of doubt upon the subject.

18. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." [Math. 10. 28.]

Remarks; The ground taken by Universalists upon this text is known to all who are acquainted with the doctrine to be this: The soul here spoken of means the animal life;—the one whom they were to fear, signifies the rulers of the Jews; and the hell in which both soul and body was to be destroyed, has reference to this same valley of Hinnom. We shall examine these points in regular order.

1. Can the soul here mean the animal life? It cannot. Every one knows that when the body is killed, the animal life is extinct; and hence it is all nonsense to talk of *destroying the soul* and the *body* as two things separate and distinct. More than this, the Saviour testifies, as recorded by Luke, that this destruction of both soul and body in hell is to take place after men are killed, or after the animal life has become extinct, which proves that the soul has reference to the spirit, or to that principle or substantial entity in man which lives after the body is dead. "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that *kill the body* and after that have *no more* that they can do: but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which *after he hath killed*, hath power to *cast into hell;* yea I say unto you fear him." [Luke 12. 4, 5.] From this it is established, and let it be remembered that the casting into hell, or the destruction of both soul and body, is to take place *after the body is killed:* and consequently after the animal life has become extinct; which proves that the *soul* does not and cannot mean the animal life! Why is it that the Saviour should commit such a blunder as speaking of killing *the body in contradistinction* to destroying the soul, if the soul sig-

nifies the animal life? The very instant the body was killed that instant the animal life would at least leave the body, and of course be beyond the power of man to harm, for they occur simultaneously. Suppose we look at the instructions of the Lord in the light of Universalism: "Fear not them which kill the body [that is which destroy the *animal life*,] but are not able to kill the soul [that is, are not able to destroy the *animal life*,] but rather fear him who after he has killed the body [that is, destroyed the *animal life*,] is able to destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell," that is, he is able to destroy both the *animal life* and the *animal life* in the valley of Hinnom! Thus Universalism makes the Saviour teach, not only that man has power to destroy the *animal life* and that he has not power to destroy the *animal life*; but also that some other man has so much power that after he has destroyed the *animal life* he is able to destroy it twice more in the valley of Hinnom! If such were the teachings of Christ, well might the Jews say as they did: "Never man spake like this man;" that is, such consummate nonsense!

2. But who were they commanded to fear? This question is easily answered by taking into consideration the fact that no man had power to do more than kill the body. Hence the Saviour says, "be not afraid of them that *kill* the body; but after that have *no more* that they can do." But there is a being who has infinitely more power than man, who, after the body is dead, has power to kill the *soul* in hell,—I say unto you *fear him.* The object of the Saviour's instruction on this occasion was to arm his disciples with Christian fortitude, and to nerve them with a holy and courageous zeal that they might be enabled to bear up without fear under the bitterest persecution and the most dreadful tortures that the ingenuity of man could invent; and even to submit with resignation to death itself, which they were assured was the very utmost extent of the power of man. Is it at all likely, is it possible that the Lord (after thus admonishing them to fear no punishment which could be inflicted by the power of man), would turn right round in the same sentence and contradict himself by telling them to be exceedingly fearful of the Jews who had power to cast them into the valley of Hinnom? Strange logic, truly; yet it is positively the conclusion into which we are driven by following out the principles of the most unscriptural system of theology. But the Saviour did not contradict himself in this manner. When the church was suffering the most violent calamities and persecutions from the hands of her enemies, the Lord says: "*Fear none of those things that shall come upon you*" [Rev. 2. 10.] The apostle Paul writes to the brethren: "In *nothing* be terrified by your adversaries." [Ph. 1. 28.] This same apostle also, after taking a view of the promises of God, comes to the following conclusion: "The Lord is my helper, and *I will not fear what man shall do unto me.*" [Heb. 13. 6.] According to Universalism, the *apostle Paul had* come to the conclusion that the Lord being his

helper he would disobey Christ; for he was determined not to fear any thing that man could do notwithstanding Christ had commanded him right the reverse,—to fear what the Jews could do to him by throwing him into the valley of Hinmon! We have now shown, and we think incontrovertibly too, that the *one* whom Jesus Christ taught his disciples to fear *was not man;* and Universalists will not say he meant the devil; hence it must mean the God who "is a consuming fire" to them that hate him. Let us now see if this can be proved: "Honor all men, love the brotherhood, *fear* God, and honor the king." [1 Pet. 2. 17.] "Serve the Lord *with fear*, and rejoice with *trembling*." [Ps. 2. 11.] "Let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and *godly fear*." [Heb. 12. 28.] "It is a *fearful thing* to fall into the hands of the living God." [Heb. 10. 31.] From these testimonies we discover that it is God whom we are to fear, and hence the one who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell is that ~~same~~ being into whose hands "it is a *fearful thing to fall!*"

3. Having thus demolished one half of the citadel let us attend to the other. What are we to understand by the word *hell?* From the foregoing it would seem but an easy task to give a most satisfactory answer to this long controverted question. 1. We have seen that it was God and not man who is to destroy both soul and body in hell; and he had no part, certainly, in putting men into the valley of Hinnom. Hence, that cannot be the *hell* here spoken of. 2. We have seen that the *soul* does not and cannot here signify the animal life, but unquestionably means the *spirit*, or that entity in man which lives after the body is killed and the mere animal life has become extinct. This is another insurmountable reason why *hell* cannot mean the valley of Hinnom; for Universalists themselves will not maintain that the fires of Hinnom can destroy the *spirit*. But should they take the ground of the materialists and contend that the soul and body die together, it will not help the case in the least: for any other way of killing the body would destroy the soul (or the spirit,) just as easily as to throw them into the fires of Hinnom: and thus again the Saviour is made to talk nonsense. 3. We have seen that this destruction of *soul* and *body* is to take place after the death of the body, and consequently after the soul and body are separated. Hence this destruction cannot take place till the resurrection, when soul and body shall be reunited as we are forced to believe from the literal resurrection of the dead. And since we have positive proof that it cannot mean the death of the body (i. e. the *first* death), and since Christ does actually speak of it as *killing the soul;* it follows hence that this language has reference to the *second death* "in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone," or the "*fiery indignation* which shall devour the adversaries." All this is to take place at the day of judgment, the resurrection, when the dead, small and great, shall stand *before God. The lake of* fire and brimstone (whatever that may sig-

nify, and it surely cannot mean anything very comfortable to the sinner)which is the second death, is the true and scriptural definition of that *hell* in which the souls and bodies of the wicked are to be destroyed; and I am certain that this position accords with the general teaching of the New Testament. But it is said that *hell* cannot signify the lake of fire, because we read that death and *hell* shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone which is the second death. Was hell cast into itself? But stop one minute and the difficulty will disappear. *That hell* which is defined by inspiration to be the "lake of fire and brimstone" is, as I have already observed, translated from the Greek word *gehenna*, but *that hell* which is to be cast into this *gehenna* or *lake of fire* is *hades* in Greek, a different word altogether, and signifies the *grave* or the *unseen world!* But again it may be urged that although this definition of *gehenna* may be correct, still it does not prove that any one will ever experience the destruction spoken of, for the text simply states that he is *able* to destroy both soul and body in hell,—not that he *will* do it! Upon this we remark in the first place, that it is charging Christ with trifling in thus holding out as an inducement or a reason why men should fear God, a punishment which he knew did not nor ever would exist, and of which no man ever was or ever will be in danger. Such hypocrisy is not chargeable to him who "taught righteousness where great assemblies stood." He was not guilty of such imposition, and no such deception can be imputed to the Son of God. But we will now show that the fact that God or Christ was able to do a thing is proof that he will do it when recorded as a prophesy, a threat, or a promise. "Whereby he is *able* even to subdue all things unto himself." [Ph. 3. 21.] Does not this prove that he will subdue all things unto himself? Universalists say so. Again: "Wherefore he is *able* also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him." [Heb. 7. 25.] All parties will admit this to be the same as though the apostle had said: "*He will* save to the uttermost," &c. Having thus clearly proved that it is God whom we are to fear, and not the rulers of the Jews; that the *soul* means the immortal spirit, and not the animal life;—that *hell* signifies the *lake of fire and brimstone*, or the *second death* beyond the resurrection, and not the valley of Hinnom,—and that God will actually, at that time, destroy the souls and bodies of the wicked: we therefore leave the matter for the reader's reflection and decision.

19. "And it came to pass that the beggar died and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." [Luke 16. 22, 23.]

Remarks: The case of the rich man and Lazarus has been discussed and rediscussed, until we cannot presume to say much upon the *subject that will* be new. However, we will try to add something.

The only way Universalists have ever sought to dispose of the matter is by making it but a parable. But in this case, as we have seen in others, Universalists but lay a snare for themselves. Although we are willing to admit the representation for the sake of the argument, to be a parable, yet we ask Universalists how they can prove it? Their answer is: Because it is recorded: "Without a parable spake he not unto them." [Math. 13. 34.] Very good. Then all that Christ taught the Jews was spoken in parables and does not refer to the future state, but is applicable to this life. Now let us ask Universalism to declare unto us this parable? "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage,—neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God being the children of the resurrection." [Math. 22. Luke 20.] This was spoken to the Jews, and remember that without a parable spake he not unto them; and remember that Universalism teaches that a parable cannot state a literal fact; and that when it refers to the future world, still it represents facts which belong exclusively to this life! What now becomes of the resurrection holiness and happiness of all mankind themselves being judges? The very plan Universalists will adopt to make this parable state facts literally as they will occur in the future state, I will adopt for the parable of the rich man and Lazarus and defy Universalists to answer it. They contend that the notion of a *hell*, *punishment*, or *judgment* beyond this life was a vagary derived by the Jews from heathen mythology; that it had no *real* foundation but existed only in the imagination; and that Christ had reference to this *when* he spake the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But I challenge Universalists to name a single parable predicated upon a speculation or chimera. We will look at one as a fair sample of the rest.—"A certain man went down from *Jerusalem* to *Jericho* and fell among *thieves*, which *stripped* him of his *raiment* and *wounded* him and departed, leaving him *half dead*. And by chance there came down a certain *priest* that way, and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. And likewise a *Levite*, when he was at the place, came and looked on him and passed by on the other side. But a certain *Samaritan* as he *journeyed* came where he was: and when he saw him he had compassion on him: and went to him and *bound up his wounds*, pouring in *oil* and *wine*, and set him on his own *beast* and brought him to an *inn* and took care of him. And on the *morrow* when he departed he took out *two pence* and gave them to the *host*." [Luke 10. 30–35.] We now ask the reader if this parable is predicated upon a chimera or any thing but possible or supposable facts? It commences in the same way and is of the same character as the one under examination? Had *Jerusalem* and *Jericho* no real existence? Were there no such men as *thieves*? and was there never such a thing as a man's being *stripped* of his *raiment*, *wounded*, and *left half dead*? Were there no such men in existence as *priests*, *Levites*, and *Samaritans*? Was the existence of oil, wine,

*beast, inn, pence, host,* &c., a chimera, a vague speculation of the Jews derived from heathen superstition? A parable is sometimes designed simply to state a fact; in order to draw them from some lesson of moral instruction: and in other cases, one fact is stated and compared with some other fact; but never did the Lord predicate a parable upon any thing that was not *fact.* Neither did the Lord ever present a parable wherein the thing represented was not at least *equal* to the representation! Universalists deny this, and say that the representation in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus was ten thousand times as great as the thing it represented. How appropriately does the wise man remark: "The legs of the lame are not *equal, so* is a *parable* in the mouth of fools." [Prov. 26. 7.] Let us now examine for a few minutes the assumption that the Jews got their idea of a future retribution from the pagans.—We are told that they must have received this doctrine from that source because it is not revealed in the Old Testament. We reply, that the heathen believed in the resurrection of the dead; and as the Jews in the days of the Saviour believed the same thing, they must therefore have received it from heathen mythology; for it is not revealed in the Jewish scriptures: and if the heathen believed the truth with regard to the resurrection, might they not also be correct concerning the future judgment? But Universalists will tell us that the resurrection is taught in the Old Testament. We say yes: as plain and no plainer, and not as often as is the doctrine of a future judgment. The Sadducees, however, did not believe in the resurrection although they believed the Old Testament. They explained and figured it away somewhat as Universalistsdthe future judgment!

Now since it is admitted by all parties that the Jews, in the days of Christ, did believe in the doctrine of a hell after death, a future judgment, and a final separation of the righteous from the wicked; we shall not argue at present from what source they received these doctrines, but will state two incontrovertible facts which must put this subject forever at rest. 1. Christ never failed on any occasion to reprove the Jews for all their *errors,* and to correct every *mistake* into which they had fallen. 2. He never reproved them for believing in the doctrine of a future general judgment, nor even intimated that this doctrine was a dangerous error and a delusive heresy! Hence, one of two conclusions must be true: either Christ believed the doctrine of a future judgment himself, just as the Jews did, or else he wished them to continue to believe a falsehood.

Is it not passing strange that Christ should believe and teach Universalism, and instead of reproving the Jews for believing the absurdity of a general day of judgment and of future punishment, as Universalists now reprove those who entertain these sentiments; he was frequently so careless as to speak of these very things and threaten the wicked with punishment in the precise language which the Jews employed to express their views on this subject, and that, too, with-

out the least intimation that he employed such words in a sense at all different from the received acceptation of them? Again: The Jews were always very much attached to their traditions and objected to every doctrine taught by Christ which crossed their track.—Now, is it not singular that notwithstanding Christ preached Universalism and opposed every thing like a general judgment, future punishment, or the existence of a hell after death; still the Jews never urged the first objection against his Universalian sentiments which if believed would have subverted their whole religion? The only consistent solution of this difficulty is that the Jews did not understand him so to preach. And here again it is most singular that notwithstanding Christ came with the express purpose of inculcating the sublime doctrine of Universalism, and of repudiating the heart-withering dogma of future punishment, and brought into requisition all his wisdom to prove his positions, still the most critical lawyers and doctors, who waited continually upon his ministry with the purpose of picking flaws in his doctrine, could not discover but that the Saviour believed exactly as they did in relation to future punishment! Now, since Christ "has set us an example that we should walk in his footsteps," it follows if Universalists preach the doctrine at all they should preach it just as Christ did, that is, say nothing about it, or at least say it so as not to be understood by the best critics in the land! And whenever we commence reproving men for believing the cruel dogma of *hell* and a future judgment, we should begin just as Christ did: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the *damnation* of *hell*?" or as it ought to be read according to Universalism, "How can ye believe in the damnation of hell?" But we now return to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Universalists ask if wicked men as soon as they die enter into misery, what is the use of a day of judgment? We ask in return, if the thief, the robber, or the murderer enters into jail, whenever arrested, where is the propriety of a day of trial at which time to bring the culprit before the court to be judged, condemned, sentenced, and committed to the penitentiary for life?

But let us see what is the true meaning of this parable, according to Universalism. *Lazarus* represents the Gentile nation, and the rich man represents the Jews; and that these two nations of course embraced at that time the whole human family. Very good. We will now read the parable according to this exposition. "There was a certain Jewish nation which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptously every day. And there was a certain Gentile nation named Lazarus, which was laid at the gate of the Jewish nation full of sores and desiring to be fed with crumbs which fell from the Jewish nation's table; moreover the dogs came and licked the Gentile nation's sores. And it came to pass that the Gentile *nation died*, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. *The Jewish nation also died* and was buried, and in hell he lifted up

his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and the Gentile nation in his bosom. And the Jewish nation cried and said: Father Abraham have mercy on me and send the Gentile nation that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said: Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise the Gentile nation his evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented. Then the Jewish nation said: I pray thee, therefore, Father, that thou would'st send the Gentile nation to my Father's house, for I have *five brethren*, that he testify to them lest they also come to this place of torment!" Now will Universalists tell us what five nations there were in existence as brethren to the Jewish nation after the Jewish and Gentile nations, which embraced the whole human family, had died? And after this let them also tell us who was the *Father* of the Jewish nation to whose house the Gentile nation was requested to go and testify! If it was Abraham, as we naturally suppose, then where was the propriety of the Jewish nation requesting the Gentile nation to go to his Father's house when the Gentile nation was there already in the person of Lazarus?

In conclusion upon this parable, whatever it may have been designed to teach, one thing is sure, it was not intended to teach Universalism. As before remarked, if Christ really taught Universalism to his disciples and to the Jews, he was most unfortunate in the choice of language and especially of his similitudes. Almost any layman in the Universalist denomination could beat him, whilst any regular clergyman who should take it into his head to preach such orthodox stuff as Christ did in this parable and throughout his ministration and call it Universalism would starve to death before he would get a call from any Universalist Church.

20. "Wherefore I say unto you: all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven nnto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever speaketh against the holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world neither in the world to come." [Math. 12. 31, 32.]

Remarks: This is another exceedingly troublesome text for Universalists. They have, we believe, adopted the exposition that "*this world*," and "*the world to come*," signify the Jewish and the Christian dispensations: and if this can be shown to be erroneous then they will be compelled to admit that this text cannot be reconciled with their doctrine. We shall in the first place admit for the sake of argument, that *this world* and *the world to come* do mean the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and thus give them all they ask and see if it will help their cause. Then it follows that those who blasphemed against the Holy Ghost in the days of Christ are not yet *forgiven* and are not yet holy and happy though they have been in eter-

nity more than 1800 years! Plainly the Christian dispensation yet continues; and it follows that those blasphemers have been all this while *sinners;* and as Universalism teaches that sin and misery always go hand in hand, it demonstrates that for more than 1800 years men have been suffering torment in the world of spirits! We thus prove that *punishment* is a poor savior! If a physician should practice on a patient 1800 years and the disease continue, we would not only conclude that he was a poor physician, but that such medicine would *never* cure the disease. Again: The Christian dispensation will continue as long as Christ remains upon the throne; and he will reign until the *resurrection*, as the apostle teaches in the 15th chap. of 1 Cor., and consequently the blasphemers against the Holy Ghost will remain sinful and miserable till that event. And as Christ "shall reign till all his enemies are put under his feet;" and as wicked men, or those who are in their sins, are enemies to Christ "by wicked works," it follows incontrovertibly that those blasphemers will not be forgiven until they are *destroyed!* And as the Christian dispensation is the dispensation of *pardon*, it follows also if they are not forgiven in this dispensation they will not be forgiven in any other; —and as Christ delivers up the *mediatorial* reign when this dispensation comes to a close, it is thus proved that the blasphemers against the Holy Ghost will never be forgiven after that, for no man can be saved from sin outside of the *mediation* of Christ! This is meeting Universalism on its own ground, and fighting it with its own weapons.

But we shall now prove that *this world* and *the world to come* signify the present and immortal states of existence, and not merely two dispensations. Let us first see what is the meaning of "*this world.*" The apostle declares: "For we brought nothing into *this world* and it is certain we can carry nothing out." [1 Tim. 6. 7.] That is, we brought nothing into *this state of existence* (not *this dispensation*) and we shall carry nothing out! The following texts are sufficiently plain without comment:

"Because as he is, so are we in *this world.*" [1 John 4. 17.]

"Hearken my beloved brethren: hath not God chosen the poor of *this world* rich in faith?" [Jam. 2. 5.]

"Charge them that are rich in *this world*, that they be not high minded." [1 Tim. 6. 17.]

"If any man among you seemeth to be wise in *this world*, let him become a fool that he may be wise." [1 Cor. 3. 18.]

"For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved *this present world.*" [2 Tim. 4. 10.]

"We should live soberly, righteously, and godly in *this present world.*" [Tit. 2. 12.]

"And he said unto them; ye are from beneath, I am from above, *ye are of this world, I am not of this world.*" [John 8. 23.]

"And Jesus said: for judgment am I come into *this world*." [John 8. 39.]

"He that loveth his life shal lose it; and he that hateth his life in *this world*, shall keep it unto life eternal." [John 12. 25.]

"Jesus answered: My kingdom is not of *this world*." [John 18. 36.]

In each of these examples the true signification of "this world," is *this state of existence;* and I here assert, fearless of contradiction, that "this world," does not once in the Bible signify the *Jewish dispensation.* But we shall now let Universalists themselves tell us what is the true meaning of *this world*, and its opposite *that world*, or *the world to come.* Turn to Luke 20. 34: "The children of *this world* marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that world* [or *the world to come*]—neither marry nor are given in marriage." Universalists admit, and even contend that *this world* and *that world* in the above text refer to the *mortal* and *immortal* states of existence! They would hardly be willing to interpret this favorite passage the way they do the other: "The children of the *Jewish dispensation* marry and are given in marriage; but they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain the *Christian dispensation* neither marry nor are given in marriage"! (See examination of Math. 22. 29, 30. Chap. 1.) Paul says that Christ is exalted, "far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in *this world* but also in *that which is to come.*" [Eph. 1. 21.] *This world* here cannot mean the Jewish dispensation; for that had come to an end long before the apostle wrote this letter. And *the world to come* in the above text cannot signify the Christian dispensation, for that *had already come*, and was not, as the apostle testifies in another place: "the *world to come* whereof we speak." [Heb. 2. 5.] But it may be said that Paul was not speaking of the future state of existence in connection with this latter text. I affirm that he was, both immediately before and immediately after he makes this remark. "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." [Heb. 1. 13.] When this is done, the immortal state of existence, or "the world to come," whereof he was speaking, will commence. In the same chapter he speaks of the destruction of death and of "him that hath the power of death, that is the devil;" and of delivering those "who through fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage;" and also speaks of "bringing many sons *unto glory.*" [Verses 10, 14, 15.] Can any man read this with his eyes half open and say that Paul was not speaking of the future state of existence?

But Universalists assert that according to our exposition the Saviour is made to contradict himself by first stating that "*all manner* of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men," and then in the next sentence affirming that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven in time nor in eternity.—Universalists do not appear to notice, however, the conjunction "but" which con-

nects these two sentences; or they would evidently see that there is no contradiction. "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, *but* (that is, except *one*,) the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost* shall not be forgiven." They might upon the same principle affirm that God contradicted himself in giving a law to our first parents: "Of *every tree of the garden* thou mayest freely eat: *but* of the tree of knowledge of good and evil *thou shalt not eat of it*," [Gen. 2. 16, 17.] But, says the objector, Christ does not say that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall *never* be forgiven! I assert that he does. "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost *hath never forgiveness*." [Mark 3. 29.]

Now Universalism cannot dispose of this. Will it say that "*never*" only signifies a little while? Let us see. God says to the man who fears his name: "I will *never* leave thee nor forsake thee," [Heb. 13. 5,] that is, I will not leave thee nor forsake thee for a little while! If the Universalist acceptation of this unpardonable sin be correct, then no Christian (much less a sinner,) can have assurance of salvation from any promise of God. But still worse: the Saviour not only declares that the man who blasphemes against the Holy Ghost shall *never* be forgiven; but also that he "is in danger of *eternal damnation*." Universalists tell us that this "*eternal damnation*" signifies the destruction of Jerusalem! Not so. We have shown, according to Universalism, that those who committed this *blasphemy* in the days of Christ are not yet forgiven, and will not be as long as the Christian dispensation continues; and as long as men are *unforgiven*, according to the Saviour's language, they are in danger of this *eternal damnation:* and dare Universalists tell us that those blasphemers are *now* in danger of the destruction of Jerusalem? Neither will it do to say that this *damnation* signifies the condemnation of a guilty conscience, which a man receives as he commits the sin; for *this* the blasphemer is never in danger of as he has it already! You could not with any propriety say to a man after he had fallen overboard that he was in danger of getting into the water! Neither could it be said concerning a man who was already in hell that he was in danger of going there! Hence this damnation is future: as the Saviour teaches: "He that believeth not *shall be damned*." [Mark 16. 16.] This does not however contradict the text which says: "He that believeth not *is condemned already;* [Jon. 3. 18,] for the unbeliever not only has the condemnation of guilt in the present tense; but he *shall be damned* also in the future! For example: Suppose a man is an unbeliever when he is thirty years old: the Saviour declares that he "*shall be damned*." Suppose he is an unbeliever when he is eighty; yet the Saviour's words remain true; He "*shall be damned*," still in the future: and suppose *he is an infidel the* very last breath he draws, and he dies and goes

into eternity an unbeliever; as there is truth in the words or Christ, he "*shall be damned*" still in the future, which proves this damnation to be beyond death and in the *eternal* state of existence, and consequently an *eternal damnation!* This corresponds exactly with the language of the text under examination: "Is in danger of *eternal damnation;* and as Universalists admit that this sin will not be forgiven in the Christian dispensation; and as we have shown (and Universalists admit the same,) that the Christian dispensation will continue till after the resurrection of the dead; it follows that this *eternal* damnation, of which these blasphemers were in danger, is beyond the *resurrection:* which agrees with Paul when he speaks of "the *resurrection of the dead* and of *eternal judgment,*" which we have already examined. This "*eternal judgment,*" which the apostle declares to be beyond the resurrection, must certainly take place before men can experience an *eternal* condemnation, for the condemnation must always follow and be according to the judgment which condemns! Here, then, we leave this text, and if Universalists can prove that the blasphemers against the Holy Ghost *will be forgiven,* and that the *eternal damnation* which they are to receive is either a guilty conscience or the destruction of Jerusalem, let them have due credit for so-doing.

21. "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond-man, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the *great day of his wrath* is come, and who shall be able to stand?" [Rev. 6. 15–17.]

Remarks: The only exposition Universalists have ever found for this text is, that it applies to the destruction of Jerusalem! But this will not do; for there is a scene described as taking place just before this "*great day of his wrath,*" in the following language: "And the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs when she is shaken of a mighty wind." [Verses 12, 13.] These same wonders which are here placed just *before* this *great day of his wrath,* are placed by the Saviour not only *after* the destruction of Jerusalem (proving that this event was not "*the great day of his wrath*" spoken of in the above proof-text,) but also beyond the tribulation of the Jews in their dispersement among the nations of the earth! "Immediately *after* the tribulation of those days shall the *sun be darkened,* and the *moon shall not give her light,* and the *stars shall fall from heaven.*" (See exam. of Math. 24., chap. 2.) Joel predicts the same day referred to in the Revelations: "I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire and pillars *of smoke;* the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon

into blood, *before* the great and terrible day of the Lord come." [Joel 2. 30, 31.]

The reader will bear in mind that whilst Joel, as well as the Revelator, places the *darkening of the sun before* "the great day of his wrath," or "the great and *terrible day* of the Lord;" the Saviour places it *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, and (as we have shown in the preceding chapter,) still in the future to us; which proves that this "great day of his wrath," when the wicked shall call for the rocks and the mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of the *Lamb*, will be at the resurrection of the dead when the *Lamb* shall appear the second time to judge the world in righteousness! Universalists sometimes quote Mal. 4. 5. upon this subject to confine, if possible, this great and terrible day to the destruction of Jerusalem. But neither will this answer their purpose: "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet *before* the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." This does not say when this "*great and dreadful day*" shall come; it only says that Elijah the prophet (whom we admit to be John the Baptist) shall come *before* that day, which is just as true if we put the day still future as it would be if it really had reference to the destruction of Jerusalem! But it may be asked: Is it likely that the prophet had reference to so long a period of time as 1800 years? You will remember, however, that this is the language of God himself; and 1800 years with him would be but a very short space of time according to the testimony of Peter. I might also ask: Is it likely that the prophet would refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, which transpired between forty and fifty years from the time John the Baptist made his appearance, which would be considered by us a long period of time? We could thus, with the consistency of Universalism, infer that "the great and dreadful day of the Lord" could not be so far off as the destruction of Jerusalem, and hence must mean *the day* when Christ was crucified!

But to return again to the text. The Revelator is speaking of opening the seven seals, and Universalists are compelled to admit, themselves being judges, that this *great day of wrath* is to take place in the future state; for just before the angel commenced opening the seals John declares that he heard "every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever" [Rev. 5. 13.]; and be it remembered that Universalists quote this very text and apply it to the resurrection state! Then immediately after comes this "*great day of his wrath;*" and immediately following this, John sees "a great multitude which no man could number; *of* all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues," which Universalists (as I have before shown) also apply to the resurrection state! Hence, if the *commencement* and the *conclusion of this series of* events are in the future state, as Universalists

have to assume, I would like to know how the *middle* can be carried back to the destruction of Jerusalem!

22. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt: and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." [Dan. 12. 2, 3.]

Remarks: Universalists have three ways of disposing, or trying to dispose, of this text. We expect to examine them all.

1. It is claimed that this language has reference to the destruction of Jerusalem from the first verse in the chapter: "And there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time." In connection with this, is quoted the language of the Saviour with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the Jews, as we freely admit: "For there shall be great tribulation such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." [Math. 24. 41.] Universalists assert that these two texts are parallel and refer to the same events. We deny it and call for proof. *The Pro and Con* of Universalism urges that the tribulation spoken of in the 24th of Matthew was *national* and not individual. (Page 158.) This is true. *Then* was the greatest *national* tribulation that the history of time records; and as the Saviour here testifies the greatest calamity of a *national* character that *shall ever be!* Universalists are continually putting down in their books and papers "NO, NOR EVER SHALL BE" in large capitals, just as though it were in their favor. But will they inform us as to what they mean by the word "*ever*?" They don't mean *eternally* do they? No; for then those who went "into *ever*-lasting punishment" would hardly get out in time for the destruction of Jerusalem! They of course mean simply a *limited duration.* Very good; then we can understand the text: "For there shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor shall be for a limited duration of time!"

But Daniel speaks of an individual, not a national tribulation,—the greatest that ever was or that ever would be, which was vividly portrayed by the Revelator in the last text examined; when men should "call for the rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the *wrath of the Lamb.*"

2. The next evasion is upon the phrase: "*Many of them.*" This, however, is but a recent quibble. Let us look into it for a moment. Universalists claim that this text cannot refer to the general resurrection from the fact that "*many of them*" does not signify *all of them*, which would certainly be the case if it had reference to the general resurrection. They ask the question: "Suppose I should say: *Many of them* that were in the house came out, would it not imply that

some that were in the house did not come out?" I answer yes. Then how can you make the text in Daniel refer to the general resurrection? I will show you. Some that were sleeping in the dust of the earth when Daniel penned this prediction arose from the dead at the resurrection of Christ. "And the graves were opened and many bodies of the saints which *slept* arose and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many." [Math. 27. 52, 53.] Now who would suppose that those saints *again died* and went back into their graves? I do not; for it is appointed unto men *once* to die" and that would be dying *twice!* The only reasonable and consistent view is that those saints went with Christ when he ascended to heaven; and he shall again return with them; for he "shall *so come* in *like manner;* and we have the most positive testimony that he shall come "with *ten thousand of his saints.*" [Jude 15.] This being true, Daniel could with all propriety declare "*many of them* that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake [at the general resurrection—not *all of them*, for some are to awake before that time at the resurrection of Christ; but all that remain will come forth at the resurrection of the just and the unjust], some to everlasting life and some to *shame* and *everlasting contempt.*"

3. The last objection is predicated upon verse 7.—"When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people all these things shall be finished." But this breaks down Universalism so far as this text is concerned. In the first place, the Jews were not scattered till after Jerusalem was destroyed; and hence this *resurrection*, which was to take place *after* the scattering of the Jews was accomplished, must also be after the destruction of Jerusalem which condemns Universalism out of its own mouth! But in the second place, this very text places the matter still in the future. Is the scattering of the Jews yet *accomplished?* Not yet; neither will it be until they cease to be scattered and are gathered back to their own land. Hence, by the very argument brought to sustain the opposite, we have proved the resurrection of Dan. 12. 2, to be yet future! But there is one other argument upon this subject which corroborates the above position, and shows that I have not misinterpreted the prophet. Universalists themselves do not contend for a literal resurrection at the downfall of Jerusalem, nor at any subsequent period till the present time; and hence they are compelled to admit that this resurrection is still future; for the last verse proves it to be *literal.* The angel says to Daniel: "But go thou thy way, till the end be, for *thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.*" [Verse 13.] Thus, Daniel himself is to have part in this resurrection of which he speaks, hence, it must refer to the future general resurrection.

23. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come *forth; they that* have done good to the resurrection of life; and

they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." [John 5, 28, 29.]

Remarks: This text would need no remarks were it not that sophistry has laid its hand upon it until, in the minds of many, its true force has become obscured. Here, as in other cases, Universalists cry *figure!* But suppose the text had read a little differently: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done *evil* to the resurrection of life as well as those that have done good;" then it would have been intensely *literal* of course, the same resurrection precisely of which Paul speaks in the 15th of 1st Cor! But why would it be literal then any more than it is now? O, because if it be understood as literal the way it now stands, it would condemn our doctrine, and hence it must certainly be figurative! This reveals the true secret of the whole matter, and if Universalists would unbosom their real feelings upon this subject they would confess it.

It is known to all men that every text which can be construed so as to favor Universalism if taken literally, must be understood in such sense: but when its advocates happen upon one of those numerous texts of scripture which most pointedly and unequivocally teach a future retribution and a day of judgment beyond the resurrection; it is immediately converted into a cluster of Eastern metaphors,—the *devil* a figure of speech,—and *hell* a bug-bear of heathen mythology and Jewish superstition! Upon this principle could they dispose of the whole Bible; and it would have been impossible for Christ to teach the doctrine of future and eternal punishment, had he believed it never so firmly, and had he brought into requisition infinite wisdom in trying to inculcate the doctrine. It could all be set aside at a single sweep of the pen by one of our modern Universalist clergymen;—"*figure of figures, says the preacher, all is figure!*" Neither is this all. When they once change it into a figure they then assume an unbounded license of making it a figure of any thing they can think of so it does not cross the path of Universalism. Like the lump of clay in the hands of the potter, so is a text of scripture in the hands of such spiritual potters. They disregard all rules of interpretation except one, and that is, Universalism must be sustained at all hazards let come what will, if the Bible has to be cut into shreds to do it!

How, I would like to know, would Universalists undertake to write out the above proof-text so as to express the orthodox faith? They could not do it, for if it can be disposed of as it now is, no man on earth can word it so as to stand the ordeal of Universalism. We are told that this text relates to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that *resurrection* signifies *conversion*. But it is a little strange that men should come forth from their graves of sin, or be converted to *damnation:* and it is also a little mysterious that others who were raised to life had *done good* in their graves of sin! But Universalism can

account for all such mysteries. As the text is all figurative, let us read it in this way: "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their figurative graves shall hear the figurative voice of the figurative Son of God, and shall figuratively come forth, they that have done figurative good to the figurative resurrection of figurative life, and they that have done figurative evil to the figurative resurrection of figurative damnation!" This mode of interpretation will give us figures to our heart's content.

But I deny that the resurrection here spoken of is conversion. The Corinthians, to whom Paul wrote, believed in conversion, yet the apostle asks: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of the dead!" [1 Cor. 15. 12.] Hence conversion is *no* resurrection! But it is said by the great *Pro* and *Con* that it cannot be understood literally, from the fact that all men have done good as well as evil; and hence every man would be raised both to *life* and *damnation!* [Page 222.] Very shrewd and cunning this, indeed. But the *Pro* and *Con* never once thought that it involved its author in the same difficulty precisely that it did us. Their coming forth at the destruction of Jerusalem from their "graves of superstition and ignorance," presents just as much of an absurdity, and would be *life* and *damnation both* to each individual, just as much as though it referred to the general resurrection, and yet our purblind *Pro and Con* could not see it. The Lord has, however, taught Universalists a lesson by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel which they would do well to learn. "When I shall say to the righteous that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness and commit iniquity, *all his righteousness shall not be remembered;* but for his iniquity that he hath committed he shall die for it. Again, when I shall say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live—he shall not die. *None of his sins shall be mentioned unto him:* he hath *done that which is lawful and right;* he shall surely live." [Ezek. 33. 13, 16.]. This is as plain as though the Lord had designed it especially to answer this objection. Suppose a man has lived a righteous life till he is forty years old, and after this practises iniquity for one year, and then dies in his sins; this man will come forth "to the *resurrection of damnation.*" But did not the man *do good?* Yes; but Jehovah himself decides that "*all his righteousness* shall not be remembered:" hence it is forgotten, and the same as though it had never been practised. Again, suppose another case. A man lives till he is forty years old in the practice of wickedness: he then turns from his sins and does that which is lawful and right—God forgives him, and he falls asleep in Jesus. Such an one will come forth "to the *resurrection of life.*" Say you this man *did evil* forty years! But stop: the Lord declares that "*none of his sins shall be mentioned unto him,* he hath done [*good*] *that which is lawful and right, he* shall surely *live,*"—he shall surely come forth to the

resurrection of *life!* Here then we have this objection fairly disposed of, and a number of other objections of a similar character are answered by the same argument.

But I am asked: "What is to be done with infants if this refers to the general resurrection? They have done neither *good* nor *evil.* I shall have to answer this question by asking *two* others. 1. What is to be done with infants in the general resurrection acording to the testimony of Paul? for he refers to that event, as Universalists admit, when he speaks of the "resurrection of the dead, both of the *just* and of the *unjust,*" and infants are never spoken of in the scriptures under either of these heads. 2. What is to be done with infants according to 1 Cor. 15. 23? for they are not *men,* and the apostle speaking of the general resurrection says: "Every *man* in his own order." And we might also ask what will be done with *women?* The fact that Christ and his apostles, in speaking of the general resurrection does not mention infants, is no reason why they were not included: neither is the fact of their not being mentioned any reason in such cases that the general resurrection was not referred to. It was an admitted fact on all hands that those who died in infancy were safe, and that their resurrection would be to the enjoyment of eternal life. Hence neither Christ nor his apostles as a general thing discussed that subject. Had they been endeavoring to teach that the wicked would be raised holy and happy, they would no doubt frequently have talked of the resurrection of infants by way of comparison. Their object, as we have seen, in all their teachings, was to inculcate the doctrine that men would be raised according to the characters they formed in this life; and this they urged as a motive to obedience. Hence the propriety of not bringing infants into the question. But if all this will not satisfy Universalists concerning this objection, we have one thing more that will. We read in the 25th of Matthew that when Christ shall come in the glory of his Father he thall separate the *righteous* from the *wicked.* This says nothing about infants, for they are neither *righteous* nor *wicked:* and more than that, all on one hand, had fed the hungry, and clothed the naked, whilst those on the other, had neglected it to their condemnation, neither of which can be said concerning infants. But ah, says the objecting Universalist, this refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and signifies the separation of the righteous disciples from the wicked Jews! Well, suppose we admit it, still it does not help the matter, for there were infants at that siege, both with the righteous disciples and with the wicked Jews, and thus we see that infants may be involved in a matter of a general character without being mentioned and with nobody referred to except those who have done either *good* or *evil!* Again, it is said that the word "*graves*" is to be understood figuratively, and as a parallel we are referred to Ezek 37. 12, 13. "Therefore prophesy and say unto them, thus saith the Lord God, behold O my people, I will open your graves, and bring

you into the land of Israel and ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened *your graves*, O my people, and brought you up out of *your graves*." But this does nothing for the cause of Universalism. The cases are not parallel, neither is the language. In Ezekiel it is "*your graves*" in the possessive case four times in succession; but in John it is "*the graves*," which I affirm is never once used figuratively in the Bible. This phrase occurs eight times, and in every instance it signifies the literal habitation of the dead. I will quote one text as a sample of all the rest. "Behold the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and *the graves* were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of *the graves* [not *their graves*], after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many." [Math. 27. 51, 53.] This demonstrates the meaning of "*the graves*" to be literal. Universalists sometimes become erudite and assert that the word rendered *graves* in John 5, 28 is not the same in the Greek as commonly signifies the literal habitation of the dead. But any one with the slightest knowledge of the Greek language can answer this objection. The word is *nemeion*, and the same that is generally employed in the New Testament to express the literal habitation of the dead. A few examples shall be given. "Jesus therefore again, groaning in himself, cometh to the [*nemeion*] *grave:* it was a *cave*, and a stone lay upon it." [John 11. 38.] "And when he was come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils coming out of the [*nemeion*] *tomb*." [Math. 8. 28.] "And he brought fine linen and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a [*nemeion*] *sepulchre*, which was hewn out of a rock." [Mark 15. 46.] "Woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites, because ye build the tombs of the prophets and garnish the [*nemeia*] *sepulchres* of the righteous." [Math. 23. 29.] So much for that objection. But the circumstances of the case and the context prove that the Saviour intended to be understood literally. In this connection he introduces three different things, which follow each other in regular succession, beginning at the least and ending with the greatest.

Reader, you will see the force of this if you reflect that Christ is about to give the strongest reasons in his possession to induce the people to believe on him as the Messiah. We shall examine these items in their order.

1. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me *hath everlasting life*, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto *life*." [Verse 24.] Let us stop here a moment and see what the Saviour designed to teach. Universalists tell us that he spoke of the conversion of sinners to Christianity. We say so too. Again they tell us that "*everlasting life*" signifies the present enjoyment of the Christian, and *does not refer to the* future state. *We* say that it *does not* mean the

present enjoyment of the Christian, and that in every instance where it occurs in the New Testament it has reference to the *immortal state* of existence! But how could Christ say that the believer *hath* everlasting life and *is passed* from death unto *life* if it has reference to the future state? This is a fair question and shall be as fairly answered. What says the Apostle John? "He that *hath* the Son *hath* life." [1 Jo. 5. 12.] According to this the believer *hath* the Son just as he *hath* life. Let us now inquire how he *hath* the Son? Not in *person* or in *fact* surely; for in this sense the Son now is only in the realms of glory above. But the Apostle Paul explains the matter. "That *Christ* may dwell *in your hearts by faith.*" [Eph. 3. 17.] "Which is *Christ in you the hope of glory.*" [Col. 1. 27.] Thus it is at the present time that the believer *hath* the Son by *faith* and *hope*, and not in *fact;* and thus it is that the believer *hath everlasting life*, or *is passed* from death *unto life;* not in *fact*, but by *faith* and *hope*. This one explanation levels Universalism to the dust, and its advocates will feel the loss of this very convenient passage. It is known to all that whenever one of those numerous texts are quoted, which declare *eternal* or *everlasting life* to be *conditional*, Universalists quote this text in the 5th of John. But as they are now routed from that retreat they stand exposed in open field, with the artillery of *forty* texts of scripture leveled against them, which most pointedly teach that *eternal* or *everlasting life* depends upon the character and conduct of men in this present state of being. This certainly is disposing of the doctrine by the wholesale!

2. But let us now see what is the next greatest thing which the Saviour introduces after the conversion of sinners to Christianity. "Verily, verily, I say unto you: the hour is coming, and now is, when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." [Verse 25.] The hour had already come, when some who were *dead* heard the voice of Christ and lived. Thus we read: "And he came and touched the bier; and they that bare him stood still. And he said: young man, I say unto thee, arise! and he that was *dead* sat up and began to speak." [Luke 7. 14, 15.] This was a greater work than for a man to believe on Christ. 3. But now for the greatest of all. "Marvel not at this: [be not astonished at either of those works which I have named; for I am now going to tell you something that I will do which is far greater than the conversion of a sinner, or bringing a dead man to life,] for the hour is coming in the which *all that are in the graves* shall hear his voice and shall come forth." Had a Universalist been there he would have said why! that is the very thing you told us awhile ago! Yes, verily, verily, instead of the Lord telling them any thing new, he was telling them exactly the same thing over and over! "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that the hour is coming when sinners shall be converted!" But I will tell you something greater than this. Well, what *is it?* "Verily, verily, I say unto you the hour is coming,

and now is, when sinners shall be converted!" But I will tell you something far greater still. What? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that the hour is coming in the which sinners shall be converted!" This is positively the doctrine Universalism makes Christ to teach!

But finally, upon this subject we remark: that the word *resurrection*, which occurs twice in this text, is not once used figuratively in the Bible! It occurs in *thirty-eight* instances, and out of that number *thirty-seven* can have no other than a literal acceptation: and is it at all likely that this individual case is to be understood in a figurative sense, and that too for no other reason than because it does not favor Universalism if taken literally? Let Universalists name an example where the word *resurrection* is used in an acknowledged figurative sense, or we cannot believe that this solitary text is an exception to the whole Bible.—Every objection thus fairly met, here stands the text unscathed in all its invulnerable and invincible strength: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth: they that have *done good* to the *resurrection of life;* and they that have *done evil* to the *resurrection of damnation.*"

**24.** "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in *the last day.*" [John 12. 48.]

Remarks: This is too plain to need comment. It tells exactly when the day of judgment shall take place;—"the *last* day!" But it may be asked: when is "the *last day?*" Universalists themselves shall answer by giving us one of their strongest proof-texts: "This is the Father's will that hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at *the last day.*" [John 6. 39.] This text Universalists apply to the resurrection; and we will give them credit for being right just *once.* Not only do they admit that "*the last day*" is to be the day of the *resurrection;* but we have the same admission from a great deal higher source! "Jesus saith unto her: thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him: I know that he shall rise again in the *resurrection* at the *last day.*" [John 11. 23, 24.] How plain, how positive, and how unambiguous is the testimony of the Bible in favor of the day of judgment as being at the resurrection of the dead! It being expressed in so many places, and in so many yet unequivocal ways, one would think the man almost insane who would call the doctrine in question.

**25.** *The sounding of the seventh or last trumpet!*

Remarks: This argument, which is contained in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Revelations is one of great importance, and shall close the present chapter. In Rev. 10. 6, the angel who was to *sound* the seventh or last trump, takes his stand, lifts his hand to *heaven and swears by him* that liveth forever and ever "that there

should be *time no longer.*" This is the first matter of importance which is to occur at the sounding of the *seventh trump;* and Universalists will hardly assert that this event has yet transpired. Again: "But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the *mystery of God should be finished,* as he hath declared to his servants *the prophets.*" [Verse 7.] Thus, we are informed that the prophecies are to be fulfilled when the seventh trumpet shall sound; or the mystery of God which he hath declared to the prophets shall be finished. This Universalists admit to be still future: for they contend that the prophets predicted a universal salvation, and they certainly cannot think that such predictions are yet fulfilled! Hence we are still agreed that the sounding of the last trump is yet future. Again: "And the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying the kingdoms of this world *are become the kingdoms of our Lord* and of his Christ." [Ib. 11, 15.] Here too Universalists will agree with us that this will not take place till Christ subdues all things unto himself which will be at the resurrection. Again, they continue: "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast *taken to thee thy great power* and hast reigned." This cannot be, as Universalists admit, until Christ delivers up the kingdom to God the Father which Paul declares to be at the resurrection of the dead. In the next verse we read: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and *the time of the dead that they should be judged.*" But this is not all: "And that thou shouldest *give reward to thy servants the prophets,* and to the saints, and them that fear thy name small and great," which cannot be done till the prophets are *raised from the dead!* Neither is this all: "And [that thou] shouldst *destroy them that corrupt the earth.*" These events are all to take place at the sounding of the last trump; and we not only have the most indubitable evidence from the items here enumerated that they all relate to the resurrection of the dead, but the Apostle Paul does most positively declare that the "dead shall be raised" at the sound of the "*last trump*" [1 Cor. 15. 22], proving conclusively that *then* and *there* the *dead* shall be *judged:* that *then* and *there* the ancient *prophets,* as well as the saints of all ages, and those that fear the name of God both small and great *shall be rewarded;* and that *then* and *there* the wicked who have *corrupted* the earth, shall be *destroyed* and banished into everlasting darkness from the presence of God and the glory of his power.

## CHAPTER IV.

### TWENTY-FIVE DISTINCT ARGUMENTS, IN PROOF OF THE CONDITIONALITY OF THE FUTURE LIFE!

"*Let me die the death of the Righteous, and let my last end be like His.*"—Num. 23. 10.

1. "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give all diligence, to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly, into the *everlasting kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." [2 Pet. 1. 10, 11.]

Remarks: Universalists try to evade the force of this text, by contending that this "everlasting kingdom," signifies the *kingdom of grace* here on earth. But this cannot be the case for this substantial reason: those brethren, addressed by the Apostle Peter, were already in the kingdom of grace, and in the enjoyment of the present salvation from sin! If this can be proved, then, "the everlasting kingdom" here spoken of is demonstrated to be the kingdom of glory. Here is our proof:—"Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth:—being born again." [1 Pet. 1, 22, 23.] "Ye also as lively stones *are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood;*—but ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an *holy nation*, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who *hath called* you *out of darkness into his marvelous light:* which in time past were not a people, but *now are the people of God;* which had not obtained mercy, but now *have obtained mercy.*" [Ib. 2. 5, 9, 10.] "For ye were as sheep going astray, but are *now returned* to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." [Ib. 25.] And in the same chapter, from which this proof-text is taken, the apostle gives them to understand that they "had been *purged* from their old sins." (Verse 9.)

From this testimony, it is manifest that those brethren, having been *purified, purged* from their old sins, and called out of darkness into his marvelous light, were then already in the kingdom of grace, and it is just as manifest that the *everlasting kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, into which they had to enter by doing "these things," was the kingdom of celestial glory! But it may be objected, that Christ is to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father. But this is not to be done until after the resurrection, and until after the saints are admitted into it: then the kingdom, with all its glorified citizens will be delivered up to the Father, when the Son shall exclaim: "Behold here am I, and the children which God hath *given me.*" (Heb. 2. 13.) This argument cannot be answered by the *sophistry or ingenuity of man.*

2. "To him that *overcometh* will I give to eat of the *tree of life*, that is in the midst of the *paradise of God.*" (Rev. 2. 7.)

Remarks: This *paradise of God* cannot refer to anything less than the upper world: for Paul speaking of visions and revelations says: "I knew a man in Christ, about fourteen years ago; whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth: such an one, caught up to the *third heaven,—into paradise.* [2 Cor. 12. 2, 3.] Before Universalists can evade the force of this argument, they must produce positive proof that *paradise* and the third heaven are here in this world.

3. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are confident I say and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord: wherefore we *labor*, that *whether present* or *absent* we may be *accepted of him.*"—[2 Cor. 5. 6, 8, 9.]

Remarks: From this text we discover, that the apostle considered it necessary to *labor* in order to be accepted of Christ whether present in the body or absent from it. This being present with Christ and being absent from the body, the apostle decides in another place to be the separation of the soul from the body of *flesh* at death. "Christ shall be magnified in my *body* whether it be by *life or death:* for to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain;—for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to *depart* and to *be with Christ*, which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the *flesh* is more needful for you." (Ph. 1. 20–24.) If this does not prove that men must *labor* in this life in order to be *accepted* of Christ, when death separates the spirit from the body, then I know not the meaning of language.

4. "*If so be* that we *suffer with him*, we shall also be *glorified together.*" (Rom. 8. 17.) "For our light affliction which is but for a moment, *worketh for us* a far more exceeding and *eternal weight of glory.*" [2 Cor. 4. 17.]

Remarks: These texts teach positively that suffering persecution for the sake of Christ was necessary, in order to be *glorified with him*, and enjoy that far more exceeding and *eternal weight of glory.* This cannot be confined to this world; for Christ was not glorified till he ascended to the right hand of God. We read concerning him whilst here on earth: "The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet *glorified.*" [John 7 39.] And as the Holy Ghost was poured out on the day of Pentecost when Christ was crowned King in Zion, it follows that he was then glorified; as Peter testified in his next discourse: "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; the God of our fathers hath *glorified* his Son Jesus." [Acts 3. 13.] From this it is established, that Christ was *glorified* in heaven; and our glorification *with him* which the apostle declares to be con-

ditional, must incontrovertibly refer to the immortal state when the dead saints shall "*be raised in glory.*"

5. "They returned aga in to Lystra, and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith; and that we must through much *tribulation* enter into the *kingdom of God.*" [Acts 14. 22.]

Remarks: The *kingdom of God* here referred to cannot mean the kingdom of grace here on earth; for those *disciples* who were "in the faith," were, as a matter of course, then in the present kingdom of grace. But we read in Revelations concerning that innumerable multitude (which Universalists admit to be in heaven as I have proved in another place), "These are they which came out of *great tribulation* and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." [Rev. 7. 14.] Thus, in taking the Universalist application of this text it proves that the *kingdom of God*, into which the disciples were to enter through *much tribulation*, is the kingdom of ultimate glory. We have a number of other texts confirming this position. Paul, although in the present kingdom of grace, expresses himself thus: "The Lord shall dèliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me *unto his heavenly kingdom*;" [2 Tim. 4. 18], and he also informs the saints of Thessalonica, that if they endured their persecutions with patience, they would "be *counted worthy* of the kingdom of God," for which they suffered. [2 Thess. 1. 5.] The unprejudiced must discover from this testimony, not only that there is a *kingdom of God* beyond this life, but also that an entrance into it depends upon our faithfulness here in time.

6. "Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your *reward in heaven*-" [Math. 5. 12.]

Remarks: Universalism teaches that the righteous as well as the wicked get a full reward for all their actions in this life. But the Saviour informs us that those who suffer persecutions for his sake, shall be rewarded in *heaven*, as they fail of receiving anything like an adequate reward here in the present state of being. The only way Universalists have ever attempted to get over this testimony is by denying that *heaven* refers to the realms of glory. But I here state, once for all, that the word *heaven*, when referred to as a place or state of happiness, has no other meaning in the New Testament than the world of celestial bliss. Let them convict me of error if they can. If we wish to know the Saviour's meaning of the word *heaven* we should examine his use of that word in the same connection,—the sermon on the mount: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in *heaven.*" (Verse 16.) "But I say unto you swear not at all, neither by *heaven* for it is God's *throne*, nor by the *earth* for it is his footstool." (Ib. 34.) "*Our Father* who art in *heaven*, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom

come, thy will be done in *earth* as it is in *heaven*." (Math. 6. 9, 10.) These examples show the meaning of the word *heaven* to be the glorious presence of God. And as certain as the Saviour's words are true the wicked will never rise to that blissful station, for they do not seek the *reward* which is in heaven.

7. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for *glory*, and *honor*, and *immortality*,—*eternal life*." (Rom. 2. 6, 7.)

Remarks: This text of itself is a complete refutation of Universalism. *Glory*, *honor*, and *immortality* are conditional, as the apostle here declares; and are suspended upon a *patient continuance in well doing*.—These exalted blessings are not to be enjoyed in this life, but belong to the future state, as we can demonstrate from several considerations. 1. Those brethren, whom the apostle addressed, were then in the full enjoyment of the loftiest blessings and privileges of a spiritual character that human beings can enjoy in this mortal state: and yet they were *seeking* for *glory*, and *honor*, and *immortality*. No consistent man will *seek* for that which he already *has*. Hence this *glory*, *honor*, and *immortality* cannot signify any blessing to be enjoyed in this life. 2. Paul testifies in 1. Cor. 15th chap. that these precious blessings belong to the *resurrection state*, and are not to be enjoyed this side of the grave. Let this be remembered. 3. D. Skinner, in his debate with A. Campbell, letter 17, paragraph 21, asserts that *aphtharsia*, the word rendered *immortality* in the above text, signifies endless bliss, and is never used in a limited sense or applied to a finite object. Universalists are bound to admit this testimony, as Rev. Skinner was their chosen champion in that discussion. But we have even a greater commentator than Skinner testifying that the glory, honor, and immortality, for which Christians are to *seek*, are not to be enjoyed in this lower world. "If ye be risen with Christ, *seek* those things *which are above where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*. Set your affections on things *above* and not on things *on the earth*." (Col. 3. 1, 2.) This settles the question that immortality, as well as glory and honor, is in the eternal world; and consequently that the "*indignation* and *wrath*, *tribulation* and *anguish*" (verses 8, 9,) placed in antithesis to them, are also to be awarded in the future state. This alone breaks down the doctrine that heaven is unconditional.

8. "For ye had compassion on me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have *in heaven* a better and an enduring *substance:* cast not away *therefore* your confidence, which hath great *recompense of reward*." (Heb. 10, 34, 35.)

Remarks: This "recompense of reward," or this "better and enduring substance," is here declared positively to be "*in heaven*," and none will obtain it till the resurrection; for the Lord declares, "Thou

shalt be *recompensed* at the resurrection of the *just.*" [Luke 14. 14.] What can be plainer against the doctrine we are opposing?

9. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, write: Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors and their works do follow them."—[Rev. 14. 13.]

Remarks: Universalists have never, as far as I know, given this text any other signification than the literal death of the saints. The *Pro and Con*, on page 345, was compelled to admit this to be its meaning. Hence it cannot be construed, with the least shade of plausibility, so as to agree with their theory. For the fact being thus emphatically stated that those who *die in the Lord* are *blessed*, proves just as emphatically that those who die out of the Lord, or die in their sins, are *cursed!* The fact of those who die in the Lord *resting* from their labor proves the opposite: that those who die out of the Lord will be among the number who "shall have no *rest* day or night." And as the *Pro and Con* was compelled to admit that the works of men *follow* them into eternity, it proves that the righteous will be rewarded in the future state for their works in this life; whilst it is just as evident that the wicked will also be rewarded for their wicked deeds in the future world, which the scriptures most distinctly affirm to be "an *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord"!

10. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand: I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give unto me in that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." [2 Tim. 4. 6–8.]

Remarks: In this text the apostle speaks of the crown of righteousness, held in reversion for himself as a reward for running the Christian race faithfully; and this was not to be conferred in this life, for he was then ready to be offered, and declares that he had *finished* his course. But the apostle points out a certain *day* at which time not only he but also all the faithful shall receive a crown of righteousness, which proves that day to be still in the future, as there are many righteous men now who have never yet received that crown! And as we have demonstrated in a preceding chapter, that the appearing of Christ will be at the resurrection; and as Paul points out *that* as the day when he should receive his crown, it follows conclusively that the crown of glory beyond the resurrection is suspended upon the condition of holding out faithful to the end. Surely this text alone settles the conditionality of the future state of happiness, which Universalists deny.

11. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon *earth*,—but lay up for yourselves treasures in *heaven*." [Math. 6 19, 20.] "*Sell that ye have* and give alms, provide yourselves bags which

wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth." [Luke 12. 33.] "Jesus said unto him: if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." [Math. 19. 21.]

Remarks: These texts unequivocally teach, that heaven is conditional, and that a treasure in that blissful world depends upon our conduct in this life. We also have it clearly demonstrated that *heaven* cannot mean any state or relation here on earth, as it is spoken of in contrast with the earth:—and more than this we have it emphatically stated that to this exalted state of felicity "*no thief approacheth.*"

12. "*Follow peace* with all men and *holiness*, without which no man shall *see the Lord*," [Heb. 12. 14.]

Remarks: This text is not quoted correctly by Universalists. You will find it in their books, almost invariably thus: "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Quoted in this manner they have no hestitancy in admitting it, as they teach that all men will be made holy in the resurrection. But when correctly quoted it gives the wicked no cloak for their sins. "*Follow peace* with all men and *holiness*, without *which* [i. e. without *following* peace and holiness:—the relative *which*, referring to the preceding sentence as its antecedent,] no man shall see the Lord." This puts a different face upon the subject, and instead of teaching what Universalists quote it to prove, it affirms in the most positive manner that without *following peace and holiness* no man shall *see* the Lord; or *enjoy* the Lord, as is frequently the meaning of the word "*see.*" For example: "What a man *seeth* why doth he yet hope for?" [Rom. 8. 24.] This signifies, as all will admit, "What a man *enjoys* why doth he yet hope for?" How is it possible to prove that there will be no difference in the future state, in the light of this text, between the holy and the unholy?

13. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the *tree of life* and may enter in through the gates *into the city.*" [Rev. 22. 14.]

Remarks: I have shown in another part of this book that Universalists are compelled to admit, as many of them have already done, that this *city* refers to the resurrection state. (See exam. of Rev. 21. 3, 4. chap 1.) This proves that keeping the commandments is essential to our happiness in the future life. We have also proved in this chapter, that the "*tree of life*" does not belong to this state of existence, but to the "paradise of God,"—the immortal world, which proves unanswerably that heaven is conditional.

14. "Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things, now they do it to obtain a *corruptible* crown, but we an *incorruptible.*" [1 Cor. 9. 25.]

Remarks: Here again we have striving in the holy war, and running in the Christian race, in order to obtain an *incorruptible* crown; and the apostle says: "*So run* that you may *obtain*," showing plainly that this crown of *incorruptibility* may be *lost* by pursuing an improper course in running, or by not striving *lawfully*. The Greek word *aphthartos*, from which we have in the common version the word *incorruptible*, is also acknowledged by Mr. Skinner to be *endless* in its signification, and that it is never in the New Testament applied to any thing of a limited character! (Campbell and Skinner Debate: let. 17, par. 21.) The reader will remember that Universalists are the very men who contend that *incorruptibility* belongs to the resurrection state, and cannot be enjoyed until "the dead shall be raised *incorruptible* and we shall be changed." (1 Cor. 15, 51.)

15. "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the *salvation* which is in Christ Jesus with *eternal glory*." (2 Tim. 2. 10.)

Remarks: This text proves that Paul did not believe the theory of Universalism; for he considered it necessary to endure all manner of hardships in proclaiming the gospel, that the *elect* (who, of course, were already in the enjoyment of the present salvation from sin), might obtain a higher salvation, and be crowned with "*eternal glory*." How perverted must be that man's understanding, who can believe Universalism in the face of such unambiguous testimony as this! And how frivolous in the light of scores of such passages to teach that the New Testament favors Universalism!

16. "And if children, then *heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ*." (Rom. 8. 17.)—"Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person as Esau, who for one morsel of meal *sold* his *birthright*." (Heb. 12. 16.)

Remarks: "All the joys of *heaven* and of the *eternal world* belong to Jesus Christ; and a man, when he becomes a *joint heir* with Christ, receives a right to eternal happiness which he did not possess before this relation of *joint heirship* existed! And as heirship with Christ, according to the above text, depends upon becoming *children* of God *by faith*, it follows that no man can have a right to the blessings of the future state until he voluntarily becomes an heir of God and a joint heir with Jesus Christ. Remember also, that there is a danger of losing our *birthright* even after we become heirs, as was the case with Esau. And as we become heirs when we are born again, the inheritance for which we then receive a right (including as we discover the *bliss of heaven*), must be understood as our *birthright:* and as certain as Paul reasoned correctly we have it in our power to forfeit that *inheritance* or sell our birthright beyond the possibility of recovery, and our doom, like Esau's, be irrevocably *fixed.* "*You know how* that afterward when he would have inher-

ited the blessing he was *rejected;* for he found no place of repentance [or of changing his father's sentence,] though he sought it *carefully with tears.*" (Heb. 12. 17.) Awful declaration!

17. "To present you *holy,* and *unblamable,* and *unreprovable* in his sight, *if ye continue in the faith, grounded* and *settled,* and be not *moved away* from the hope of the gospel." (Col. 1. 22, 23.)

Remarks: Universalism teaches the unconditional *holiness* as well as happiness of all mankind; that is, without any condition to be performed in this life. But the apostle here emphatically asserts that, in order to be presented "*holy*" in the sight of God, we must attend to conditions in this life,—we must "*continue in the faith,*" and "be not *moved away* from the *hope of the gospel.*" If Universalists could dispose of this proof, I should despair of attempting to prove that God said: "Let there be light, and there was light."

18. "For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." (1 Tim. 4. 8.)

Remarks: This testimony is as plain and as positive as language can make it, that the *life to come* is suspended upon the practice of *godliness.* It cannot be contended that the *life to come* in this text signifies the spiritual life of the gospel or the present enjoyment of the Christian,—for this those brethren were then in possession of; and hence, the *life to come* must have reference only to the life beyond the resurrection. How vain to think that such a text as this can be explained away so as to favor Universalism!

19. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,—to an *inheritance incorruptible* and *undefiled,* and that *fadeth not away,* reserved in *heaven* for you who are kept by the *power of God through faith* unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." (1 Pet. 1. 3-5.)

Remarks: This language cannot possibly be evaded. It teaches that the *inheritance* for which the saints *hoped* was *incorruptible,*—that same word *aphthartos,* which is never applied to anything, except the bliss of heaven. It teaches in the second place that this *inheritance* is actually "*in heaven;*" and the Apostle Peter, in that same connection, uses the word heaven in such a manner as demonstrates his meaning to be the *world* of immortal *glory.* "By them that have preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from *heaven.*" [Ib. 12.] This clearly shows where this *incorruptible inheritance* is to be enjoyed. And it teaches in the third place, that this *incorruptible, heavenly inheritance* is conditional, and to be enjoyed by those "who are *kept* by the power of God through faith." Paul explains this power of God, and declares: "I am not ashamed *of the Gospel* of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to

every one that believeth." [Rom. 1. 16.] Those then who are kept by the gospel (which can only be by obeying its *precepts*,) are the ones who are ultimately to enjoy that incorruptible inheritance *within the vail*, whither the forerunner has for us entered. But it may be objected that this incorruptible inheritance is "to be revealed in the *last time*," and the apostle says: "Even now are there many anti-christs, whereby we know that it is the *last time*." (1 John 2. 18.) But what last time? There are various last times spoken of in the scriptures.—There were the last times of the Jewish dispensation, and the apostle testifies that Christ "was manifest in these *last times* for you." (1 Pet. 1. 20.) There was also the "*last time*" of the apostolic embassy, or of miraculous demonstration; when, as the Apostle John declares, anti-christ should come to deceive the very elect if possible. But neither of these is the *last time*, when the saints shall enjoy that incorruptible inheritance that fadeth not away. Paul, treating on the resurrection, (1 Cor, 15. 24,) says: "Then cometh the *end*," or the "*last time*" when those who are Christ's, or who have been "kept by the power of God, *through* faith unto salvation," shall enjoy this incorruptible inheritance; for he does there most distinctly affirm, that they shall be raised to INCORRUPTIBILITY, when death, the *last* enemy shall be destroyed.

20. "Be thou faithful *unto death*, and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. 2. 10.)

Remarks: Universalists can make nothing of this death except the literal departure from this world. In making it signify a moral death they turn the text into nonsense: Be faithful until you are morally dead, i. e. *dead in sin*, and I will give you a crown of life!" An inducement to commit sin. It is therefore most manifest that this "*crown of life*," as a reward of faithfulness, is beyond the natural death of the body and consequently in heaven. How strange that any man at all acquainted with the apostolic teaching should ever have supposed that the New Testament favors Universalism!

21. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne." [Rev. 3. 21.]

Remarks: Neither can this language be applied to any station or privilege which those who overcame were to enjoy in this life. How did Christ overcome? Ans. By continuing faithful unto death. When was he seated with his Father upon his throne? Ans. When he arose from the dead, and ascended to *heaven*. This text pointedly affirms: that we are to *overcome* and sit down upon a throne, "*even as*" Christ did. Hence, we are not to overcome until we have held out faithful *to death;* and we cannot sit down with Christ in his throne until, like him, we arise from the grave and ascend to heaven. *But remember that this* glorious privilege is suspended upon the con-

dition of *overcoming* or continuing *faithful until death.* Forget it not!

22. "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, *looking unto Jesus* the author and finisher of our faith, who for the *joy that was set before him* endured the cross, *despising the shame*, and is set down on the right hand of the "*throne of God.*" [Heb. 12. 1, 2.]

Remarks: Here the saints are pointed to Christ as an example; and his *enduring* the cross and *despising* the shame, in order to obtain "*the joy that was set before him,*" namely: exaltation to the "*right hand of the throne of God,*" is held out as an inducement to the saints to bear patiently their persecutions, with the exceeding great and precious promise, that "if we suffer we shall also reign with him." (2 Tim. 2. 12.) The apostle also gives them to understand concerning Christ: "Though he were a Son he learned obedience by the things which he *suffered*, and being made *perfect* [that is, exalted into the presence of God,] he became the author of *eternal salvation* to all them that *obey him.*" (Heb. 5. 8, 9.) All that will *obey him* shall be raised to the same glorified and exalted station which he himself occupies as the result of his unfailing obedience. Query: If it were necessary for Christ, the Lamb of God, to bear the cross and be made *perfect* by *obedience* in order to obtain a seat at his Father's right hand as we are here informed; what should we think of the man who would dare affirm that the wicked who live and die in utter rebellion against Christ, will be just as certain of that crown and wreath of honor as the Messiah himself?

23. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on *eternal life.*" (1 Tim. 6. 12.)

Remarks: I have, in the preceding chapter, proved, that neither Christ nor the apostles speak of "*eternal life*" or "*everlasting life,*" only with direct reference to the immortal state of existence. I here re-assert that there is not one text to be found in the New Testament where the phrase eternal or everlasting life signifies the present spiritual life of the Christian. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that such was sometimes its signification, still it could not possibly have that meaning in the above text. Timothy was undoubtedly a Christian and in actual possession of all the present spiritual salvation as a member of Christ's body; yet he was not in possession of *eternal* life, for he had to fight the good fight of faith before that boon could be enjoyed. He was also to instruct others who, though like himself, were in the enjoyment of the present salvation, to lay "up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come that they may *lay hold* on *eternal life.*" (Ibid 19.) These facts and considerations demonstrate beyond controversy that "*eternal life*" belongs to the future state; and it just as evidently follows that our future beatitude depends upon the characters we form here in time.

24. "Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised *Christ shall profit you nothing.*" (Gal. 5. 2.)

Remarks: Our salvation for time and eternity, as Universalists admit, is staked upon the merits of Christ. "*Neither is there salvation in any other*, for there is *none other name under heaven*, given among men, *whereby we must be saved.*" (Acts 4. 12.) And had not Christ died, the whole human race would have been eternally lost or else saved in their sins for, "without shedding of blood there can be *no remission.*" (Heb. 9. 22.) Yet, notwithstanding all this, the apostle taught the brethren who were converted from among the Jews that, should they renounce justification by the faith of Christ and seek it by going back to circumcision and the law of Moses, Christ should *profit* them *nothing.* It would be precisely the same as though Christ had not died; for the apostle does affirm, with direct reference to this point, "If righteousness came by the *law* then *Christ is dead in vain!*" (Gal. 2. 21.) If Universalists, to escape this difficulty, should take the ground that Christ benefits men only with respect to time, and that they may be saved eternally nevertheless, they only renounce Universalism in another way by giving up the promise to Abraham as well as three-fourths of all their other proof-texts, for they are based upon Christ as the Saviour of the world. But since the Saviour has positively affirmed that no man can come unto the Father but by him (John 14. 6.), it follows that had not Christ died the posterity of Adam would have eternally perished, or else been saved without coming to God. Take the argument which way we will, it is a death-blow to Universalism.

25. "For he that is entered into his *rest*, he also hath ceased from his own works as God did from his; let us *labor therefore* to enter into *that rest* lest any man *fall* after the same example of unbelief." [Heb. 4. 10, 11.]

Remarks: This is our closing argument for this chapter, and a most sweeping one it is. The apostle here informs us that we must *labor* to obtain *that rest* into which Christ entered when he had finished the work of redemption, as God rested when he had consummated the work of creation. In order to know what *rest* Christ entered into when he had finished his work, we shall hear the apostle in the same connection. "Seeing, then, that we have a great High Priest that is *passed into the heavens* Jesus the Son of God." [Ib. 14.] "Let us *labor therefore* to enter into *that rest!*" But the apostle makes the matter even stronger, if possible, in the first verse of this chapter: "Let us therefore *fear* lest a promise being left us of entering into *his rest* any of you should seem to *come short of it.*" From all this it is as evident as language can make it that "His Rest," or "That Rest" most unquestionably signifies "Heaven Itself" into *which*, as Paul here affirms, Christ has entered High Priest over the *house of God: and it is* also as manifestly evident that this *rest* can

be forfeited by disobedience, and that it actually will be unless we "*labor*" to enter into it. But Universalists will try to evade this argument by assuming that the rest here referred to is the spiritual rest of the believer in the church, and will quote the third verse of this chapter as proof. "We which have believed *do enter into rest.*" This, it is said, proves *that rest* to be then present. Not quite so fast. Paul, speaking of the general resurrection, says: "But some man will say, how are the dead raised up? and with what body *do they come?*" [1 Cor. 15. 35.] Here is the same word *do*, though *present* in its natural form and signification it is applied to the future resurrection. It signifies the same precisely as if he had said: "With what body *shall* they come?" Thus we understand the apostle: "We which have believed *shall* enter into *rest*," at the resurrection of the dead. We thus prefer in all cases to let the Bible explain itself and God be His own interpreter. But the whole connection forbids the above assumption. Those brethren had just been addressed as *holy*. "Wherefore *holy brethren*, partakers of the heavenly calling." [Ib. 3. 1.] Hence they were then in the enjoyment of the *present rest of the gospel*, and it would have been very absurd for Paul to exhort them to *labor* to enter into *that rest* when they were already in it as much as they possibly could be.

Reader: beware, "lest there be in you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God," [Ib. 12,] "and he swear in his *wrath* that you shall never enter into his rest!" [Ib. 13.]

"And should your ears refuse
The language of his grace,
And hearts grow hard like stubborn Jews,
That unbelieving race;
The Lord, in vengeance drest,
Will lift his hand and swear:
You that despised my promised *rest*
Shall never enter there."

## CHAPTER V.

### PERSONALITY OF THE DEVIL.

*"Resist the Devil and he will flee from you."*—Jas. 4. 7.

Universalists deny in toto that there is now, or ever was such a spiritual being as the *devil*, either real or personal; and contend that all the idea designed to be conveyed by that word is a personification of the principle of *evil* in its various forms. It is applied in a metaphorical sense, they tell us, to various objects such as *human nature*, —the *Roman government*,—*wicked men* such as *Judas*,—*the lusts of the flesh*, &c., &c., but in every case it is to be understood as a figure of speech and nothing more.

This *figure* was known in days of old, and designated by many titles, expressing his character, attributes, and offices. He was called "*Abaddon*,"—"*Apolion*,"—"*Belial*,"—"*Accuser*,"—"*The Beast*,"—"*The Angel of the bottomless pit*,"—"*The great Dragon*," "*Beelzebub*,"—"*Deceiver*,"—"*The Evil One*,"—"*The God of this world*,"—"*A Murderer*,"—"*A Liar*,"—"*The Prince of this world*," "*The Prince of the power of the air*,"—"*The Old Serpent*,"—"*The Devil*,"—"*The Father of lies*,"—"*The Tempter*,"—"*Satan*,"—and "*The Prince of Devils*."! [Rev. 9. 11. 12. 10. 19. 19, 20. 12. 7, 9. 1 Pet. 5. 8. Math, 12. 24. John 17, 15. 2 Cor. 4. 4. John 8. 44. 2 Cor. 16. 15. 1 John, 3. 8. Eph. 2. 2. Eph. 6. 12. Math. 4. 3.]

He must truly have been an extraordinary metaphor, possessing doubly as many names as the Almighty himself! And we will disprove the existence of God, as a real personal being upon the same principle precisely by which Universalists make out the devil but a figure of speech,—a personification of the principle of evil.—If because Judas was called "*a devil*" [John 6. 70,] and Peter "*Satan*" [Math. 16.23.], there is therefore no devil except Judas and Peter then, according to the same logic, because Moses was called "*a god*" [Ex. 7. 1,] and Abraham "*lord*" [Gen. 18. 12.] there is therefore no other *Lord God* except Abraham and Moses! If, because God is said to perform many wonderful and mighty works he is therefore a real being and not a personification of a *good* principle; then, according to the same logic, the devil must be a real being and not a mere personification of an evil principle, for many wonderful works in the scriptures are ascribed to him. He appeared in the presence of God, and they held a conversation together concerning Job. Mark the fact: they both conversed together; and if it be consistent to say that one was a mere principle of evil, the other was nothing but a mere principle *of good*.

*Again: He caused* a wind to blow down the house on Job's children

and kill them:—brought the Sabians upon Job's oxen who took them all away,—caused the fire of God to fall from Heaven and burn up Job's sheep: and finally he smote Job with sore boils from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet. If this was all done by a figure of speech they must have had rather a literal sort of metaphors in Job's time! This same figure of speech conveyed the Saviour around from place to place,—conversed with him,—quoted scripture,—fell from heaven like lightning,—broke chains and fetters,—had power to cast men into prison,—to walk about as a roaring lion,—to work miracles,—to overcome seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew,—to bind a woman eighteen years,—to possess a herd of two thousand swine and drive them down into the sea and drown them,—is in possession of a kingdom,—is to be judged at the last day,—was conscious that there was a time coming when he had to be punished,—confessed Jesus Christ to be the Son of God,—is finally to be tormented in the lake of fire and brimstone which is the second death: and strange to tell, all this is spoken of with reference to an eastern metaphor,—a figure of speech; and not a real being visible or invisible, neither in heaven above, earth beneath, or the waters under the earth! [Job 1st and 2d chap. Math. 4. 6. Rev. 13. 13. Rev. 2. 10. 1 Pet. 5. 8 Acts 19. 16. Luke 10. 18. Luke 13. 16. Mark 5, 12, 13. Math. 12. 26. Mark 5. 4. 2 Pet. 2. 4. Rev. 20. 10. Math 8. 29.]

If the devil, possessing all the foregoing characteristics, and performing all these wonderful exploits, be nothing but a metaphor, a mere principle of *evil*, then I defy Universalists to prove that God is anything more than a principle of *good* the opposite of evil; and that the Bible is any thing more than a mere principle of humbuggery, intended to deceive and mislead rather than to instruct.

*God* and the *devil* are always spoken of in the scriptures as exact opposites, just as much so as are the principles of *good* and *evil*. God is the author of *truth*, and the devil is the father of *lies*. God is the Father of *lights*, and the devil is the Prince of *darkness*. Hence we read: "Ye cannot serve *God* and *mammon*. "In this the *children of God* are manifest and the *children of the devil*." "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils* and not to *God*." "What concord hath *Christ* with *Belial*?" "He that *committeth sin is of the devil*,—whosoever *doeth not righteousness is not of God*." "If *God* were your *Father* ye would love me,—ye are of your *father* the *devil*." [Math. 6. 24. 1 John 3. 8-10. 1 Cor. 10. 20. 2 Cor. 6. 15. John 8. 42-44.]

All *good*, as the reader can discover from the foregoing quotations, is ascribed to *God*, whilst the *devil* is spoken of as the author of all *evil*. Now as God is not merely that good principle of which he is the author and representative, neither is the devil that evil principle of which he is the personification. Is the principle of evil the author or personification of itself? If so, then the principle of good is the author of itself, and consequently it is all the God there is in the uni-

verse! Just as certain as God, the author of good, is a real being, just so certain is Satan, the author of evil, a real being, and not that evil principle of which he is the author.—Thus, upon the same principle that the devil can be philosophized into a figure of speech or a personification of a bad principle, can the Almighty Jehovah be figured out of existence as a real being, and proved to be no more than an Eastern metaphor.

But let us try some of the *real* significations of the devil, according to Universalism, such as the wicked Jews,—the Roman government,—Judas,—Peter,— human nature,—the lusts of the flesh,—the carnal mind, &c.

The best plan of testing a doctrine, is to substitute the definition for the word itself, and see what kind of sense it makes. We shall thus give the Universalist theory of no-devil-logic a fair trial. "And his fame went throughout all Syria and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those that were possessed with *Roman governments*, and he healed them. [Math. 4. 24.]—"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the *Roman government* and his angels." [Math 25, 41.] "And when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: and after the sop, *Peter* entered into him." [John 13. 26, 27.] Or perhaps Judas entered into himself, since he was as much of a devil as Peter was, and of course before that he was out of himself! "Resist *Peter* and he will flee from you." [Jam. 4, 7.] "Be sober, be vigilant, for your adversary *Peter*, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." [1 Pet. 5. 8.] "And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold *Peter* hath desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat." (Luke 22. 31." "And the God of peace shall bruise *Judas*, or *Peter*, or the *Roman government*, or the *Jewish nation*, under your feet shortly." (Rom. 16, 20.) "There was given me a thorn in the flesh the messenger of *Judas* to buffet me." (2 Cor. 12. 7.) "And he was casting out a *Judas* and it was dumb: and it came to pass; when *Judas* was gone out, the dumb spake, and the people wondered. But some of them said: he casteth out *Judas* through *Peter*, the prince of *Judas*." (Luke 11. 14, 15.) "Ye are of your father *Peter*, and the lusts of *Peter* will ye do. He was a murderer; from the beginning and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him." (John 8. 44.) "And he asked him, what is thy name? And the *human nature* answered, my name is legion, for we are many:—and all the *human natures* besought him saying send us into the swine that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave, and the *human natures* went out and entered into the swine and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea and were choked." (Mark 5. 9–13.) "As they went, behold they brought to him a dumb man possessed of a *human nature:* and when the *human nature* was cast out the dumb spake, and the multitude

marveled, saying, it was never so seen in Israel." (Math. 9. 33.) No wonder the people were astonished that a man could speak after his human nature was cast out of him! "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven *human natures*. (Mark 16. 9.) Wonder how many she had left? "And the Lord God said unto the *carnal mind*, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field, upon thy *belly* shalt thou go and *dust* shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." (Gen. 3. 14.) The carnal mind must surely have a singular mode of traveling and live upon extraordinary diet! "And I saw an angel come down from heaven having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand, and he laid hold on the *lusts of the flesh*, that old *carnal mind* with his *Judas* and *Peter*, and the *Roman Government*, and the Jewish Nation and *human nature*, etc., etc., and bound them a thousand years." [Rev. 20. 1, 2.] "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the *lusts of the flesh*: and when he had fasted forty days and forty nights he was afterwards an hungered: and when the *lusts of the flesh* came to him they said unto him, if thou be the Son of God command that these stones be made bread. But he answered the lusts of the flesh, and said: it is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God. Then the *lusts of the flesh* taketh him into the holy city and placeth him on the pinnacle of the temple and saith unto him, if thou be the Son of God cast thyself down, for it is written He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus answered the *lusts of the flesh*, it is written thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again, the *lusts of the flesh* taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and said unto him, all these things will I give unto thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then said Jesus: get behind me thou *lusts of the flesh*, for it is written thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the *lusts of the flesh* leaveth him and behold, angels came and ministered unto him." [Math. 4. 1-11.] Had Christ no *lusts of the flesh* before the devil came to him? And after the devil left him had he no lusts of the flesh? If his own lusts or his own carnal mind was the devil that tempted him, was he not sinful? He certainly was: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God." (Rom 8. 7.) His human nature was unquestionably sinful, if it was the devil that tempted him; for that which is holy will not try to tempt any one into wickedness. When the Pharisees told Christ he had a devil it was looked upon then, and has always been by professed Christians since as blasphemy, until Universalists have recently made the discovery that the Pharisees told the truth, and that Christ had as much of a devil as anybody! If the devil which came to Christ and

went away from him was not a real being—nothing but a figure of speech—then what were the *angels* which came to him after the devil left him? If they were but metaphors, then how can any man prove that Christ was a real being or any thing more than an eastern metaphor? But if the *angels* were real beings, and *Christ* a real being, how can it be supposed that the devil was but a figure of speech when he had fully as much to do in the premises as the others?

"Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the *lusts of his flesh*, he disputed about the body of Moses." (Jude 9.) Thus according to Universalism, a spirit had a contention with the *lusts of his flesh*, and the Saviour teaches, that "a spirit hath not *flesh* and bones." [Luke 24. 39.]

"And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the *dragon:* and the *dragon* fought, and his angels." (Rev. 12. 7.) As the *dragon* and his *angels*, were nothing but *figures of speech;* it is not likely that *Michael* and his *angels* were real beings. Thus, we have two armies of figures meeting in battle array on the plains of heaven, with two eminent metaphors at their head as commanders-in-chief!

"And the seventy returned again with joy saying, even the *lusts of the flesh* are subject unto us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld the *lusts of the flesh* as lightning fall from heaven." [Luke 10, 17, 18.] "And no marvel for *the lust of the flesh* is transformed into an angel of light." [2 Cor. 11. 14.] "And when the thousand years are expired *the lust of the flesh* shall be loosed out of his prison. [Rev. 20. 7.]

From the foregoing we discover that the *lust of the flesh* does not suit exactly as a definition for the *devil:* but we shall try it the other way. If the *devil* mean *lust* of course then *lust* means the *devil.*

"Now these things were our examples, to the intent that we should not *devil* after evil things, as they also *deviled.*" [1 Cor. 10. 6.] "When the *devil* has conceived he bringeth forth sin." [Jam. 1. 15.] "You ask and receive not because you ask amiss that you may consume it upon your *devils.*" [Jam. 4. 3.] "Abstain from fleshly *devils* which war against the soul." [1 Pet. 2. 11.] "All that are in the world, the *devil* of the flesh, the *devil* of the eye and the *devil* of life, are not of the Father." [1 John 2. 16.] "The world passeth away and the *devil* thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." [Ibid. 17.] "The flesh *devils* against the Spirit and the Spirit *devils* against the flesh and these are contrary the one to the other." [Gal. 5. 17.] "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare and into many foolish and hurtful *devils* which drown men in destruction and perdition." [1 Tim. 6. 9.] "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful *devils.*" [Eph. 4. 23.] "For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive *silly women* laden with sins, led away with divers *devils.*" [2 Tim. 3. 6.]

"The time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own *devils* shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears." [2 Tim. 4. 3.] "How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly *devils*." [Jude 18.] "Flee also youthful *devils*." [2 Tim. 2. 22.] Thus, according to Universalism, we have *divers* kinds of *devils* such as "*foolish devils*,"—"*Ungodly devils*,"—"*deceitful devils*,"—"*fleshly devils*,"—"*hurtful devils*,"—"*youthful devils*;" and as all positive adjectives imply their opposites: there should be another class, such as "*wise devils*,"—"*godly devils*,"—"*spiritual devils*,"—"*peaceable devils*"—"*old devils*," &c., &c., and the Lord only knows how many more kinds of devils there are if Universalism be true! Thus Universalists defeat their purpose, for in trying to oppose the existence of *one* devil, they make out as many devils as there were frogs in Egypt!

Let us answer a very common objection. "Every man is *tempted* when he is drawn away of his own *lusts* and enticed." "Christ was *tempted* in all points, like as we are." (Jam. 1. 14. Heb. 4. 15.) Hence the conclusion is, that the devil which tempted Christ must have been his own lusts. But we have examined Christ's temptation, and have found that the devil which tempted him could not possibly have been his lusts; for it is absurd to suppose that his *lusts* were *away from him* forty days, came *to him*,—stood *before him*,—got *behind him*, and finally *left him*. Hence this objection cannot be well founded. But how dispose of it? Easily enough. "Every man is *tempted* when he is drawn away of his own lusts and *enticed*;" but who is the *tempter*? Who is the *enticer*? Not his own *lusts*, certainly; for they are the principle by which he is induced to yield to the temptation, after it is presented. But who *presents* it? That's the point. The answer is, the *devil*. Is he who presents the temptation, and that principle which leads you to yield to it after it is presented, one and the same thing? James does not say that a man's *lust* is the *tempter*. Here is where Universalists mistake the whole matter. Let us illustrate it. Suppose a worthless spendthrift comes to you and holds out every possible inducement to *entice* or *tempt* you to the dram shop. You resist at first, knowing that such a course of conduct is opposed to your profession as a Christian. But "your adversary the devil" through that wicked agent (as all wicked men are agents of the devil), still persists in his devices, and taxes his sagacity to lure you from the path of duty. Your old love for ardent spirits —that *lust of the flesh*, which you had once overcome—is now excited, and finally you yield the point, and are led away captive by the devil at his will. Now any one can see that lust is not the *tempter*, or enticer in this case, yet when the temptation is presented by the *devil* either personally or by human agency, and we give way to it, then is the time and that is the way that we are "drawn away of our own lusts and enticed." Thus would the Saviour have been tempted

had he yielded to the proposals of the adversary,—he would have been "drawn away [not *tempted*] of his own lusts;" but "*tempted* of the devil." The fact that Christ had all the lusts of the flesh before the devil came to him that he ever had, and that he retained them all after the adversary left him, ought to be of itself sufficient to convince us that the devil which tempted him was not his lusts; and this being so, it follows that the scriptural doctrine of the devil is against Universalism, though the *devil himself* may be in favor of it!

In conclusion we remark, that there is not a text in the Bible which speaks of the devil as the lusts of the flesh:—not one! But suppose there were a text which figuratively applied the term *devil* to the *lusts of the flesh;* if this would prove that there is no real personal devil, and that the lust of the flesh is all the devil there is: then it follows because Paul says concerning some who were the enemies of the cross of Christ: "Whose *god* is their *belly;*" (Phil. 3. 19,) that there is no other *God* in the universe except a man's *belly!* This seems to a large extent the practical belief of the world, but it will hardly pass as a Bible doctrine!

## CHAPTER VI.

### "THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS."

*"But he being full of Compassion, forgave their Iniquity, and Destroyed them not."*—Psalm 78. 38.

Of all the unscriptural, unphilosophical speculations, connected with modern Universalism, that which relates to the forgiveness of sins, is apparently the most perfectly unreasonable. This system of faith teaches that the sinner, by an immutable decree of the Almighty, is doomed unconditionally to suffer the full demands of justice for every sin he commits (let that demand be little or much) before he can be forgiven, and that *forgiveness* in no case shields from deserved punishment. This doctrine teaches that, notwithstanding all the efforts on the part of the Messiah, in bringing about a remedial system,—notwithstanding all the merciful provisions of the gospel of peace, with all its exceeding great and precious promises, and notwithstanding the God and Father of our spirits out of unbounded compassion bowed the heavens and gave his only and well-beloved Son to suffer and die for the sinner; yet, there is no way made possible by which he can escape the penalty of a broken law,—no mercy can be extended towards him until he has supped the last bitter dreg from the cup of punishment; and then will God forgive his sins! What nonsense!

We expect in this chapter to urge weighty considerations against this hypothesis, and to prove from the plain teachings of revelation and from the nature of God's moral government, that the forgiveness of sins consists in the remission or warding off of deserved punishment, and that there would be no such thing as the exercise of mercy in the economy of salvation were such not the case.

Universalists quote several texts of scripture which we shall examine, and which they claim as positive proof in favor of the assumption that God never forgives the sinner until he has inflicted upon him all the punishment his sins deserve. "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is *pardoned*, for she hath received of the Lord's hand *double* for all her sins." [Is. 40. 2.] This is the most prominent text in the Bible upon which the doctrine relies as favoring the above position. But does this verse prove that Jerusalem was *pardoned* because she had received *punishment* to the full demands of justice? By no means as we shall show. But admit, for the sake of the argument, that "*double for all her sins*" does as Universalists contend relate to punishment, it would prove too much for the theory, and consequently prove nothing. For if God did not forgive Jerusalem

until he had inflicted "*double*" the amount of punishment due "*for all her sins,*" then "take heed lest he spare not you." Is this forgiving upon receipt of the full amount of punishment? If God forgives the sinner after inflicting double the demands of justice, may he not vary as much the other way and forgive him when half the just amount of punishment is inflicted? And if God varies so much from the Universalist rule as to inflict punishment to double the demands of justice may he not punish to all eternity? Is it not a true principle that he who will be unjust in little will also be unjust in much?

But the "*double*" which Jerusalem received did not refer to *punishment.* The prophet speaking of Jerusalem bears me out in this assertion. "After all that is come upon us for our evil deeds and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God *hast punished us less than our iniquities deserve* and hast given us such *deliverance* as this." [Ezra 9. 13.] Thus it is manifest that the *double* does not refer to punishment; for Ezra informs us that they were *punished less* than their sins deserved, and hence the "*double*" which they received has reference to something else. But what? "For your shame you shall have double, and for confusion they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore *in their land* they shall possess *the double;* everlasting *joy* shall be unto them." [Isa. 61. 7.] This needs no comment.

Again: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." [Prov. 11. 21.] This is heard in nearly every sermon in defense of Universalism. But even taking it in an unconditional sense, it contradicts the doctrine, for hundreds and thousands of wicked men in the height of their wickedness fall instantly dead, and consequently go to heaven *unpunished.* Universalists will not take the ground that *death* is the punishment for sin, for they teach that God designed when he created man that he should die, and that death is in no sense of the word a consequence of transgression. Universalism thus teaches that death is a work of God, and John classes it among "the works of the devil" which Christ came to destroy; hence *God* and the *devil* signify the same thing! Neither will they take the position that the wicked who leave *this world* without punishment receive it in the next: hence they are compelled to admit according to their teaching that the wicked (many of them) *shall go unpunished.*

But in this text as well as in many other such expressions, there is a condition implied though not *here* expressed as in the promise to Abraham. (See exam. of Gen. 22. 18. chap 1.) It is to be understood the same as though it had read thus: "Though hand join in hand the wicked shall not be unpunished, *unless they turn from their wickedness.*" This condition is *implied* in this case because clearly *expressed* upon the same subject in another connection. "The soul that sinneth it shall die. [This is as emphatic as the expression, "the wicked *shall* not be unpunished."] But if the wicked will turn *from all his sins that* he hath committed and keep all my statutes,

and do that which is lawful and right, he *shall surely live*, he *shall not die*." [Ezek. 18, 20. 21.] or (which is exactly the same), the punishment which was threatened *shall not be inflicted*. Thus, notwithstanding God should threaten a wicked man with death (which was *deserved punishment* unquestionably or else God would not have threatened it,) still that wicked man can escape this punishment by reformation and by obtaining pardon, as the prophet assures us. Hence, there is a condition *implied* in all such declarations if not expressed, find them where you will in the Bible! This rule of *implication* will be found an exceeding troublesome thing to Universalists.

Another text is presented. "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." [Exodus 34. 6, 7.] According to the Universalist exposition of this text, God will certainly punish a wicked man all that his sins deserve, let him repent, turn from his wickedness, or do what he will. Such an interpretation makes the text most positively contradict itself. "The Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious, long-suffering* and *abundant in goodness;* and therefore he will never cease to punish the sinner, let him repent as he may, until the very last stripe demanded by inflexible justice is inflicted! Two declarations more palpably contradictory are hardly to be found. It is about like this: "The Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious, long-suffering*, and *abundant in goodness*,"—therefore he is the most unmerciful being in the universe!

But it may be thought that my view of the subject presents as much of a contradiction as the above. Not so. I claim with the Bible, that God "will by *no means clear the guilty*,"—no, not by forgiveness, nor punishment, nor any thing else. But Universalism teaches that God clears the guilty by *punishment!* When in fact, let a man be punished to any degree, he is just as guilty as though he had not been punished at all. Put a man into the penitentiary three years for theft, and when he serves his time out he is no more innocent than when he commenced! But you ask how this apparent difficulty will be disposed of? In this way, and in this way only.—The guilty man must cease to be guilty, by becoming innocent; and he must become innocent, by complying with the Lord's own terms of pardon, and by receiving the forgiveness of his sins and the removal of guilt from his conscience. Thus, God can be *abundant* in *goodness*, and yet by no means clear the guilty. But he can clear the innocent and be good to the guilty in giving them an opportunity of becoming innocent,—obtaining the forgiveness of sins, and thus be cleared from suffering the punishment, which would most surely have been inflicted had they continued guilty. This text, as we discover, proves the exact opposite of the theory that forgiveness does not *shield from* justly deserved punishment. If there be no provis-

ion made by which the sinner may escape the sentence of retributive justice, then the "goodness" of God is far from being "abundant!" Talking of a "God of cruelty" and "a system of vindictive tyranny," comes with a poor grace from those who look upon the character of God in the light of Universalism. If the God and Father of our spirits be as destitute of mercy and goodness as this doctrine represents, how we are to infer a universal salvation from his character and attributes is a mystery which I do not expect to understand!

Let us now look at a few texts of scripture which clearly prove that the mercy or goodness of the Lord exercised in the forgiveness of sins shields men from justly deserved punishment. The verse at the head of this chapter is one directly to the point: "But he being full of compassion *forgave their iniquity*, and *destroyed them not.*" [Psalm 78. 38.] From this it is evident that the only reason they were not *destroyed* was because God "*forgave their iniquity.*" This cannot be doubted. Now since God would have destroyed them had he not forgiven their iniquity, it follows that forgiveness in this case delivered them from deserved punishment; for had they not *deserved* this destruction there would have been no danger of the Almighty inflicting it!" This testimony cannot be set aside.

Again: "The Lord is merciful and gracious slow to anger and plenteous in mercy; *he hath not dealt with us after our sins nor rewarded us according to our iniquities;* for as the heaven is high above the earth so great is his mercy toward them that fear him: as far as the east is from the west so far *hath he removed our transgressions from us.*" [Psalms 103. 8–12.] Had we no other testimony this one text would be of itself sufficient to overturn this doctrine relative to the forgiveness of sins. This passage teaches that on account of the fact that God is *merciful* and *gracious*, he did not deal with men *according to their sins* nor *reward them according to their iniquity*, but removed their *transgressions* from them as far as the east is from the west! This shows that God exercises mercy in forgiving men's sins by not dealing with them according as their sins deserve, or by not rewarding them according to their iniquity. Jeremiah prays to God concerning the wicked who had dug a pit for him: "*Forgive not their iniquity neither blot out their sins* from thy sight, *but* let them be *overthrown.*" This proves that they would not be *overthrown* if God should forgive their iniquity; and as God would not overthrow them unless they *deserved it*, it follows that forgiveness shields from deserved punishment!

Now hear the language of God to the prophet concerning Judah: "It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them; that they may return every man from his evil way that I may *forgive their iniquity and sin.*" [Jer. 36. 3.] And what would be the result? "If so be they will hearken and turn *every man from his* evil way, that I may *repent of the evil* which I *purposed to do unto them.*" [Jer 26. 3.] Thus, when God forgives a

man's sins he shields him from the punishment or evil which he had purposed to bring upon him, and consequently from the punishment which his sins deserve, for God would not have purposed to bring punishment upon men which they did not deserve.

The Sodomites were destroyed for their sins, and Christ tells us that if they had repented they "would have remained unto this day." (Math. 11. 23.) They would consequently have escaped deserved punishment; for Universalists will not claim that God inflicted upon them above their just deserts! Christ says: "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke 13. 3.] Universalism says: "Ye shall all likewise perish if ye deserve it whether ye repent or not; for neither repentance, forgiveness, the mercy of God, nor anything else can shield a man from deserved punishment."

Again: Christ brings forward a similitude to illustrate the doctrine of forgiveness. "There was a certain creditor which had two debtors; the one owed him five hundred pence and the other fifty; and when they had nothing to pay he frankly forgave them both." (Luke 7. 41, 42.) The great matter in getting the true idea of a similitude is to understand exactly the points of comparison; and not to make points where there are none. In this similitude the points are four: —1. *Creditor*:—2. *Debtor*:—3. *Debt*: and 4. The amount of money due in the debt. The *creditor* represents *God*: the *debtor* represents *man*: the *debt* represents *sin*; and the amount of money due stands for the punishment due on account of sin. This will hardly be doubted. Now we all know that when a debt is forgiven the debtor, as a matter of course, is released from paying the amount of money for which that debt calls: and who must not see (if there be any appropriateness in the Saviour's comparison,) that when God forgives the sinner the debt of sin is canceled, the sinner is released from paying the amount of punishment due on account of the *debt*, and that God relinquishes all former claims against him, both parties standing in the same relation precisely as though the debt had not been contracted. This argument can be fortified by collateral evidence. We are taught by the Saviour in the Lord's prayer, to petition our heavenly Father thus: "Forgive us our *debts* as we forgive our *debtors*." (Math. 6. 12.) Now, in order to be certain what is meant by the *debt* here spoken of, let us read Luke's version of the same prayer: "Forgive us our *sins*, for we forgive every one that is *indebted* to us." (Luke 11. 4.) Thus it is incontrovertibly established that *sin* is the *debt* for which we are to petition forgiveness. All we have to do in order to arrive at a correct understanding of the manner in which God forgives sins, is to ask ourselves the question: How do we forgive our debtors? Common sense tells us by relinquishing our claims against them, and releasing them from paying the amount the debt calls for. This Universalists themselves will admit. Does it not follow then that God forgives us by canceling the debt of sin and releasing us from paying the amount of punishment due on its account?

Universalists will try to avoid this difficulty (and well they might, as it subverts the very foundation of their theory.). They will no doubt deny that punishment is the consideration called for in the debt of sin. But they admit that there is punishment due for every sin we commit; and that it must certainly and inevitably be inflicted. We say so too, that is unless the debt be forgiven. But if there be punishment due on account of our sins, who is it due to? Not to man, certainly, although he has to suffer it, just as the man has to suffer the loss of ten dollars when he pays a debt to that amount: but the amount of punishment is due to God, and to be paid or suffered by us, unless forgiven. Universalists justly deny the absurdity that man, by any thing he can do, can bring God in debt to him; and hence the amount of punishment due in the debt of sin is due from man to God, and not from God to man, just as a convict owes the State a debt of punishment for crime, and pays it by service in prison, unless forgiven by the governor.

A prominent Universalist once when pressed upon this point took the position that love was the consideration due in the debt which we owe God: and quoted the Poet to prove it:

"But tears of grief can ne'er repay,
The *debt of love* I owe."

But this does not help the matter in the least. We freely admit that we owe even a whole lifetime of love and gratitude to God, but this is far from being the debt of sin for which we are to ask forgiveness. "The debt of love we owe," is on account of what God has done for us; whilst the debt of sin is on account of what man has done against God. But suppose we should admit that love is the amount included in the debt of sin, then it follows when God forgives our sins, he releases us from the obligation of ever loving him any more! But when the minister, above referred to, discovered the absurdity into which he had run his argument he changed ground and took the position that God requires obedience on account of our sins! and that this is the *debt* to which the Saviour refers in the Lord's prayer. But this does not improve the matter in the least. For in the first place, it was due to God that we should obey him in every thing even before we had sinned, or whether we committed sin or not: and sin cannot certainly make that a debt which was due before the sin was committed. And worse still; if our obligation to obey God be the amount due for the debt of sin, then when the debt is forgiven all claims for obedience are relinquished, and we are released from obligation to obey God! But from this position also our hero soon fled and assumed another, which he was certain could be maintained. Forgiveness, said he, consists in God's punishing men for their sins as much as they deserve, and then saving them from committing sin in the future! But is this an improvement? Let us see. As we are to forgive our debtors as God forgives us, we must therefore *when a man owes* us five hundred pence make him pay up the

last farthing, and then be sure never to let him get in debt to us again! Reader, what would you think of us if you were indebted to us one thousand dollars, which you could not pay, and we should forgive you according to Universalism? I know scores of individuals who would become very benevolent in forgiving poor men their debts if they were only initiated into the sublime mysteries of this doctrine.

But if God in all cases punishes the sinner all that his sins deserves what then does he remit? Not deserved punishment; for that must be inevitably suffered. Not the sinner; for he goes free as a matter of right. Not future sins; for sins must first be *com*-mitted before they can be *re*-mitted. Not future undeserved punishment; for such punishment God never intends to inflict. What then, I ask, does the *forgiveness* of Universalism consist in? Ans. Nothing. Christ suffered and died for nothing because man was in danger of nothing except that which he would have to suffer any how; and finally, the whole human family shall be eternally saved from nothing, because there is absolutely nothing to be saved from. Glorious deliverance! I am here reminded of the anecdote of an infidel who joined the Universalists at the organization of a church in one of the eastern states. When the meeting had broken up, one of the bystanders addressed him: Mr. F.: What made you join the Universalists? I thought you professed to be nothing. I do, replied he, and that is the very reason why I joined them because they come the nearest *nothing* of any thing I ever saw!

As Universalism teaches that God never remits the punishment for sin, it follows that the Sodomites will never be raised from the dead, for they died as a punishment for sin. How, then, can they be made holy and happy in the resurrection?

If Universalism be true, then there can be no such thing as repentance in the common acceptation of that word expected of any man. No man can repent of sins he has never committed: and as for repenting of past sins, it is of no avail, as he knows he must suffer for them, penitent or impenitent, to the full demands of justice. Hence the doctrine of repentance is out of the question, and ought to be expunged from Christianity.

Universalists sometimes speak of God in such manner that one would suppose him constituted essentially of love, and that mercy was almost his only attribute; and then again, when we hear them descant upon his uncompromising strictness and severity in punishing the sinner with the very last stripe demanded by infinite justice let circumstances be as they may, we are led to conclude that, instead of mercy forming a part of his character, he resembles more a cruel tyrant than a God of unbounded compassion and benevolence! Look at the premises and conclusion. "God loves the sinner with an everlasting love, and is infinitely better to him than the most affectionate earthly parent can be to his son," and therefore he will

never forgive him and never cease to punish him until he has made him suffer the last stripe his sins deserve!

Yes, when God forgives a debt he makes the debtor first square up the account to the last farthing, and then forgives him after the debt is paid! Forgiveness is everywhere held out in the Bible as a great blessing: and the way God *blesses* the sinner is to inflict upon him the severest penalty of a broken law and make him suffer all that his sins deserve. It is also a doctrine plainly taught in the Bible that God will *curse* men for their wickedness, and the way this is done, according to Universalism, is to *bless* them with *stripes of forgiveness*. Thus, to *bless* with *punishment* and *curse* with *forgiveness*, or *vice versa*, are about one and the same thing if Universalism be true!

What would a prisoner, for example, in the penitentiary think of the Governor, if he should come to him after he had served his time out and offer him pardon? Why, he would look upon it as an insult to his common sense, and would answer the Governor: I have a right to my liberty now and no thanks to you, sir, for I have earned it by the hardest. I would have taken it as an act of kindness had you pardoned me two years ago, and released me from the remainder of my deserved punishment; but now to offer me pardon and liberty as an act of mercy when I have as good right to it as you or any man in the state is an imposition!

Neither would such prisoner be induced to love the Governor from such mockery, but exactly the reverse as any one can see. All this applies in full force to the *deity* of Universalism. If the Governor should forgive the convict in the midst of his punishment it would have much the appearance of mercy, and would naturally call forth corresponding love and gratitude on the part of the prisoner. But there would be no mercy in the Governor's forgiving the convict, and still keeping him in prison, neither would there be the least mercy in pretending to forgive him after he had suffered all the punishment that the law demanded. Hence we are driven to the conclusion, if Universalism be true, that *mercy* should not be numbered among the attributes of God! But suppose it should be claimed that after the sinner is punished all that his sins deserve, God exercises mercy towards him in warding off future punishment? To this I reply: that the future punishment to which he may be exposed is either his just deserts or it is not. If it is, then the mercy of God exercised in forgiveness shields from deserved punishment, which upturns Universalism. But if this future punishment, to which the individual may be exposed, be not just, it requires nothing but justice on the part of God to shield him from it, and mercy has no hand in the matter! Hence, every exertion made on the part of Universalism to extricate itself from the absurdities of the contradictory theology, the deeper and deeper is it involved.

*But the doctrine of* Universalism upon this subject can also be

broken down by comparing it with the forgiveness which Christians are to exercise toward one another; for the apostle exhorts: "Even as Christ *forgave* you *so also do ye.*" [Col. 3. 13.] Now, suppose a brother has trespassed against you by slandering your character; all will admit that such an offender justly deserves to be punished. But suppose he comes to you confessed his fault and desires you to forgive him; you are bound to do it. But do you not by this act of mercy shield the offender from deserved punishment? If you do not then there is no mercy in the forgiveness, for he is precisely as well off without it as with it. But it should here be remarked that God sometimes chastises the offender in order to bring him to reformation (as will be discovered in another part of this work), and when this end is attained the transgressor is pardoned. But it does not follow from this as Universalism supposes, that the offender was punished all that his sins deserve. This assumption supposes that all punishment is disciplinary, and that sin in no case deserves any more punishment than will be for the good of the transgressor. But a more erroneous view has never been entertained as will be hereafter shown. God punishes or chastises his children to make them reform, and when this end is effected forgives them in order to shield them from the remainder of the punishment which their sins justly deserve; hence the same thing is also required of the church; and we have an example recorded in confirmation of this very position. "Sufficient to such a man is this *punishment*, which was inflicted of many: so that contrariwise ye ought to *forgive him.*" (2 Cor. 2. 6., 7.) But did he receive all the punishment his sins justly deserved? By no means: but his punishment was "*sufficient*" to reform him; and hence the church is exhorted to exercise *mercy* toward him in *forgiving* his iniquity and not punishing him according to the strict demands of justice!

But there is another view of the subject which we now present, which breaks down the doctrine of Universalism, and puts it forever to rest. We take the position at the start, that if there be no such thing in the economy of salvation as releasing the sinner from punishment which his sins justly deserve then Christ suffered in vain and might as well never have left the bosom of his Father for all the benefit we can derive from his death. In sustaining this position it will be discovered that the theory of Universalism connected with this subject is based upon a palpable misunderstanding of the atonement of Christ. It may be considered almost like attempting to prove that fire will burn in arguing the above proposition: for it is as axiomatic as that two and two make four. If man by an irrevocable decree of Jehovah is doomed unconditionally to suffer all that his sins deserve as a pre-requisite to pardon, could he not then, I ask, have suffered this full amount of punishment as well without the sufferings of Christ as with them? Again: If all that is necessary as a pre-requisite to forgiveness is for the sinner to suffer out the full

demands of justice, then could not God have been just and the justifier of him who was sufficiently punished as well without the death and sufferings of Christ as with them? Once more: If Christ suffered and died for the sins of men, and if men have to suffer for their own sins all the punishment they deserve before they can be forgiven, then does it not follow that either Christ or the sinner suffers *unjustly?* But finally: If the Scriptures do teach that Christ suffered and died on account of our sins, does it not follow that when we accept of the merits of Christ we are thereby released from suffering the punishment due on account of our sins because of the sufferings of our surety? If not, then in the name of reason what benefit do we derive from the sufferings of Christ? *Just none at all.* From this it is indisputably evident, if Universalism be true, that Christ might as well have saved himself the trouble (I speak with reverence) of coming down into this sinful world, and suffering the shameful and ignominious death of the cross for the sins of men, since all his prayers and groans, and sweat and blood, are of no avail, and have no tendency whatever toward bettering the sinner's condition or shielding him from any punishment to which he might be exposed! For, according to this hard-hearted system, God had decreed by his immutable counsel that no reprieve,—no sacrifice,—no atonement,—no mediation,—no pardon,—no justification,—no repentance, nor any nor all other things combined, could tend to mitigate the sinner's punishment! No, reader, nothing does this system of relentless cruelty hold forth, as the "glad tidings of great joy" to the sinner, let him be never so penitent, but the bitter cup of sufferings which he is compelled to drink to the very dregs, before the scepter of pardon can be extended!

"If such the sweetness of the stream,
What must the fountain be?"

Paul affirms that "Christ died to save sinners;" but what from? Not from sin, for punishment does that.—Not from punishment, for this they are compelled to suffer. The penalty of the *broken law* must in all cases be inflicted, and never, until this is done, can the sinner become righteous: and thus it is demonstrated, if this view be correct, that righteousness comes by the *law;* and hence we are compelled to come to the same conclusion that the apostle did: "*If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.*" [Gal. 2. 21.] But as righteousness does not come in this manner, we are bound still to believe with Paul, how muchsoever it may conflict with Universalism, that "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.*" [Gal. 3. 13.]

Universalists mildly tell us that Christ died to commend the love of God to man, and quote the apostle to prove it: "But God *commendeth his love toward us* in that, while we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us.*" [Rom. 5. 8.] This, however, is a fatal text to Universalism: *for if God* commended his love toward us, in giving Christ

to suffer and die; then it is certain that we must derive some benefit from his death and sufferings which, we have discovered cannot be the case according to Universalism! Had Paul believed the absurd assumption of Universalism, he would have expressed himself differently: "But God commendeth his cruelty towards us in that whilst we were yet sinners, in great need of assistance, he sent his only begotten Son to suffer and die the shameful death of the cross for nothing at all; as every sinner has to suffer just as much exactly as though Christ had not died." If this is commending the love of God to man, then *love* and *wrath*, mercy and cruelty are synonymous terms!

Some of the orthodox may have gone to extremes the other way, and Universalists have taken advantage of this and made it a pretext for denying in toto the doctrine of vicarious atonement. It is true, that one extreme naturally begets another; but still there is no reason, because some may have abused the doctrine, that Universalists should deny it altogether. It is urged by some that Christ absolutely paid off the debt of sin to God, and suffered in his own person all the punishment due for all the sins of Adam's race. Then, Universalists ask, do the sins of men deserve endless damnation? If so, did Christ suffer endless damnation or its equivalent? If so then he is suffering still, and will continue to suffer. This difficulty cannot be met according to the above position. Another objection urged against this view of the subject is, that if Christ paid off the whole debt and suffered all that our sins deserved, then no thanks to God for our salvation, for the glory and gratitude are all due to Christ alone. But a third objection urged against this doctrine of pay-up is, that it makes it absolutely necessary for each individual to commit just so much sin, if not, there would be a danger of Christ's paying too much or else not enough. But all these difficulties can be easily and satisfactorily disposed of if we look at the object of Christ's sufferings in the true light of revelation. Although Christ suffered in our stead and bore our sins in his own body, yet it does not follow from this that Christ must necessarily have suffered all the punishment our sins deserve. The true doctrine is this, as the scriptures clearly and abundantly teach, that Christ as a daysman, suffered only enough to make a reconciliation possible and make it just for God to forgive the sinner, and thus shield him from his deserved punishment. The apostle declares: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time his *righteousness* [or *obedience* in suffering upon the cross,] *that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.*" [Rom. 3. 25, 26.]. Hence, God could not, without violating his justice, have pardoned the sins of one of Adam's race had not Christ suffered for our sins—the just for the unjust. Thus Christ having suffered enough and only enough

to bring man within the reach of God's mercy that he might be just and at the same time deliver the sinner from the punishment which his sins justly deserved, upon the condition of submitting to the terms of pardon, makes the debt of gratitude for this great salvation due from the sinner equally to God and to Christ. God was willing to save the sinner from the punishment due on account of his sins provided the sinner was willing to be saved, yet he could not do it without violating his immutable justice, unless Christ, as an infinite sin-offering, should voluntarily suffer in our stead enough that mercy might reach us and the justice of God be sustained. This must be regarded as sound scriptural doctrine. Universalists, however, laugh at this idea, but in doing so they are only laughing at the Apostle Paul and unvailing the infidelity which always laughs at any doctrine which holds forth the real character and heinousness of sin.

We shall now close this chapter by presenting the manifest contrast between Universalism and the Bible, with reference to the sufferings of Christ:

Bible: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." [Rom. 3. 24.]

Universalism: Being justified out of pure necessity through the virtue there is in punishment.

Bible: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." [Is. 53. 4.]

Universalism: Surely we shall bear our own griefs and carry our own sorrows; and therefore, Isaiah, surely you are mistaken!

Bible: "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities." [Verse 5.]

Universalism: We must all be wounded for our own transgressions and bruised for our own iniquities just as much as though Christ had not been bruised at all!

Bible: "The chastisement of our peace was upon him." [Ibid.]

Universalism: The chastisement of our peace must be upon our own heads notwithstanding!

Bible: "With his stripes we are healed." [Ibid.]

Universalism: With our own stripes we are healed and not until we receive the very last one!

Bible: "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." [Verse 6.]

Universalism: The Lord hath laid on us all our own iniquity and there is no possible way for us to escape the penalty any more than if Christ had never died!

Bible: "For the transgression of my people was he stricken." [Verse 8.]

Universalism: The people shall be stricken for their own transgressions and the sufferings of Christ cannot help them in the least!

Bible: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify *many, for he shall* bear their iniquities." [Verse 11.]

*Universalism: By* the virtue there is in punishment shall my

righteous servant justify many, for they shall all bear their own iniquities!

Bible: "Forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." [Eph. 4. 32.]

Universalism: Forgive one another even as God for the sake of punishment forgives every one that is forgiven!

Bible: "Repent ye therefore and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." [Acts 3. 19.]

Universalism: Wait patiently until you are punished as much as your sins deserve and they shall then all be blotted out as a matter of course, and you need not expect it before!

Bible: "For Christ hath suffered for sins the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." [1 Pet. 18.]

Universalism: Every unjust man must suffer for his own sins until they are paid up, and thus punishment will make him just and bring him to God independent of the sufferings of Christ!

Bible: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." [Gal. 3. 13.]

Universalism: We must redeem ourselves from the curse of the law by suffering all the penalty which the law demands and hence Christ suffered the curse for nothing!

Bible: "Who his ownself bear our sins in his own body on the tree." [1 Pet. 2. 24.]

Universalism: We our ownselves are compelled to bear our own sins in our own bodies until we have suffered all the punishment which justice demands; and hence the death of Christ is of no more avail than the death of Nero!

Reader, can you believe Universalism and at the same time believe the Bible? If so, may the Lord open your eyes.

## CHAPTER VII.

### COMPUNCTIONS OF CONSCIENCE.

*"Speaking lies in Hypocrisy, having their Conscience seared with a hot iron."*—1 Tim. 4. 2.

Universalism confines all punishment for sin to this life; and as it is a stubborn fact, which Universalists as well as others are compelled to admit that wicked men, as a general thing in point of worldly prosperity, are equally successful with the righteous, and many times more so, hence, it is claimed that the punishment which God invariably inflicts upon the sinner is mental anguish or remorse of conscience.

Universalists have been allowed to say and write almost any thing upon this subject without being formally opposed; and some have even yielded the whole ground as being too metaphysical and abstruse to fathom, whilst others have conceded enough by admitting that God does sometimes punish men for their sins with the upbraidings of a guilty conscience, to give Universalism a good claim to correctness upon this subject.

It is true that this subject has been casually noticed in works opposed to Universalism, and occasionally perhaps a difficulty presented in opposition to the doctrine; but nearly always concessions enough in the same connection, not only to strengthen the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees of Universalism, but also to nullify the force of the very arguments that had been presented. For this reason I have concluded to devote a chapter to the consideration of this question.

It will be admitted by all that the punishment which God inflicts for sin must be dealt out upon the principles of equality and justice, that is, the man who is the greatest sinner should suffer the severest penalty. This will not be disputed. But is such the real state of the case admitting the truth of the assumption that remorse of conscience is the only divine punishment now to be inflicted for sin? Let us see.

The apostle declares in the text quoted at the head of this chapter that certain characters had become so depraved that their *consciences were seared* with a hot iron. In another place he gives us to understand what he means by this phrase: "Who being *past feeling* have given themselves over unto lasciviousness to work all uncleanness with greediness." [Eph. 4. 19.] Now as certain as the apostle has *spoken it,* wicked men can become so debased and their consciences *may become seared to* such extent that they get past feeling, and

consequently are devoid of remorse. Then it follows, that the more wicked men can become, the less punishment they have to endure, until finally they can become so bad as to be out of the reach of all punishment, and then the Almighty can do nothing with them since their consciences are so seared as to be past feeling remorse; and as he will not, according to Universalism, punish them in the future state, hence they go entirely unwhipped of justice.

We not only have the testimony of the apostle, that a man may become so hardened as to have no more compunctions of conscience, but the observation of every reader must bear witness to the same truth. Observe that youth when he commences the practice of profane swearing. The first oath he utters strikes to his heart a dagger of the keenest guilt, and haunts his midnight hours of slumber. But he continues the practice and, like all wicked men, waxes worse and worse. But as he becomes more and more profane the Universalist's hell instead of getting hotter and hotter, as it should, grows cooler and cooler until finally the last spark of flame becomes extinguished and the fire goes out. And now the result is he can utter oaths (the sound of which would at first have made the blood to chill in his veins) without feeling the least compunctions of conscience, and could even at every breath blaspheme the name of God and damn his own soul to perdition with a smile upon his countenance, and in the very height of worldly enjoyment. He is certainly in a very comfortable *hell*, notwithstanding its horrors as depicted by Universalism, and the thought of leaving it and going to heaven would be the most wretched feeling he ever experienced in his life; and I also believe that could he be induced to pray at all, his first and most fervent prayer would be for God always to keep him in just such a hell as that! He could not be pleased better than to be eternally tormented in the fires of Universalism!

It is certainly a position which no one in his senses will dispute, that as men increase in wickedness the lashings of a guilty conscience become less and less severe until all moral susceptibility to remorse finally dies away,—the conscience grows callous by oft-repeated wounds, and the individual gets *past feeling*. This is seen in a boy, who commences his career of wickedness by stealing a pin from his mother's sleeve. He has been taught that it is wrong to steal and hence his conscience goads him for the deed. His next crime is in taking fruit from a neighbor's orchard. From this he goes to a neighboring store and when unobserved slips a knife into his pocket. He next proceeds to the gambling house where by drinking and gambling he spends his money and, to make up his loss, he takes his stand in the highway with pistol in hand and robs a traveler of a thousand dollars! And from this he may be seen as a pirate traversing the high seas, and with the most heartless cruelty butchering hundreds of men, women and children, and sinking them to the bottom of the ocean, and all with less remorse of conscience than he ex-

perienced when first he took the pin from his mother's sleeve! Now according to Universalism when this person had committed the most trifling offense, and was consequently the least guilty, he was in the very hottest part of hell, but when he became the most wicked, and of course deserving of the severest punishment, the *hell* of Universalism had entirely *cooled off* and this conscience-seared wretch found himself free from restraint,—he had sinned himself out of *hell*, and was on the broad road to heavenly bliss destitute of all punishment while his hands were dripping with the blood of slaughtered innocence! It is of no avail for Universalists to contend here, as did George Rogers in the *Pro and Con*, that the fact that men are past feeling, and have their conscience seared is punishment of itself! Singular punishment truly and they not feel it! We might just as logically contend that the swine which wallows in yonder mire, because insusceptible of remorse, is punished for the sin of breaking down a fence, as to take the absurd position that men are severely punished when all the evidence in the world could not make them believe but that they were the happiest beings alive. Go to that sot who is now, perhaps for the thousandth time, reeling under his load of strong drink and, according to Universalism, in hell-torment; look into his bloated face and blood-shotten eyes and ask him how he feels; and if his tongue is not too nearly paralyzed to articulate an answer, he will tell you he never felt better in his life! Ask him if he desires to be more happy, and he will tell you he does not, that he is just as happy as he can be: and yet he is in hell, according to this sublime doctrine, where the worm dies not and the fire is not quenched! If you wish to make that man miserable only convince him that his destiny is to go to heaven, and your object will be accomplished, unless you should convince him at the same time that there would be a distillery carried on in the celestial kingdom, and even then he would prefer remaining in this Universalian *hell* where he could be certain of it! It may be said that although the man does not get his punishment whilst in this condition, wait till he gets sober, and then he will feel it! But how about the man who is always drunk until he wakes up sober in the paradise of God? Such a man, according to Universalism, certainly goes to heaven because he had become too bad to be punished. He had become so wicked that the Universalian hell would take no hold on him; and hence he must either be saved in his sins or else be punished in the next life with hell fire hotter than a guilty conscience!

I do not deny that men will suffer from a guilty conscience when they commence practicing iniquity; but I do contend, and every candid person must admit the same, that when they get so depraved as to be "*past feeling*" their conscience no longer goads them, and hence, if that be the punishment inflicted for sin, they go clear when they deserve the most, utterly free from any punishment at all. This *doctrine must naturally* encourage the sinner to push on as fast as he

can in the ways of wickedness in order to get past feeling as soon as possible, that he may then and forever afterward be clear of punishment! But it may be objected that although his conscience ceases to upbraid him, yet he is punished in some other way; for the scriptures declare that the wicked "shall not live out half their days." [Ps. 55. 23.] So much the better for him, as he will get to heaven one half quicker than he would had he been a Christian man!

No man surely will feel remorse of conscience for going to heaven, even if he should get there in one half the time that the Lord intended he should! If a man was a firm believer in Universalism and should murder his neighbor should he feel guilty for it? Why should he? God foreordained it, and the doctrine of Universalism informs him that it will all be overruled for his good. And as for the man whom he murdered, he has done him an act of kindness by sending him to heaven a little in advance of his time! Why then should his conscience reproach him? No, sir, 'tis all a hoax! No man who honestly believes in Universalism as taught in the *Pro and Con* will feel remorse let him do what he will. As well might a stone have compunctions of conscience for rolling down a hill after some one had started it, as for a man to feel guilty for doing what God had absolutely decreed and what would be overruled for the greatest possible good of all parties concerned!

If a man is, as that authority teaches, a mere machine, and not a moral agent, then there can be no such thing as compunctions of conscience. Let a man be convinced when he steals his neighbor's horse that he acts out of pure necessity, and not from freedom of will,—that God from all eternity had decreed that very act, at that very time, and by that very instrumentality, and how much will his conscience goad him? Just as much, verily, as it would goad a man for being born with but one hand. As certain as "*a free will is a chimera*," which the *Pro and Con* asserts, (page 290) so certain is every thing like guilt or remorse of conscience "*a chimera*," and hence Universalism from root to branch is predicated upon a chimerical and baseless assumption. And here we discover by logical deduction the infidelity of the whole system in denying human responsibility and the possibility of divine punishment. "What need we of farther witness?"

But admitting all for which Universalists contend upon this subject, still there are difficulties which must forever block their way. They are compelled to take one of two grounds: either that *conscience* is in all cases and at all times an unvarying guide and an infallible criterion relative to the exact amount of punishment due for sin, or else that it is not. If it be not a correct rule and an infallible minister of justice, then it cannot be the Lord's plan of punishing sinners; for all must admit his rule to be like himself: "Without variableness or shadow of turning." But if it be in all cases an *infallible guide* then it demonstrates the truth of endless damnation,

for the consciences of hundreds and thousands of wicked men have borne witness to this doctrine. Myriads have gone into eternity with the most perfect assurance of their own consciences that eternal perdition was to be their doom! Thus, let them accept which horn of this dilemma they may choose it gores the doctrine to death.

But why should Universalists condemn their opponents? They admit that punishment is a motive to deter from the commission of crime. If so, why condemn the orthodox since they believe in the compunctions of conscience—all the punishment for which Universalists contend—and in addition to this they believe in punishment beyond death; and hence have all the incentive that Uinversalists have and a great deal more! But they tell us that from the penalty of Universalism there is no escape for the transgressor; and "herein consists the moral power of Universalism." But the orthodox contend as much as do the Universalists that it is impossible for the sinner to escape the compunctions of conscience, that is until his conscience becomes seared, and hence they have all the moral power for which Universalists contend; and in addition to this they hold out the infinite motive of future and eternal punishment which will be as certainly and inevitably inflicted as the other, unless a reformation of life takes place before death. More than this, the compunctions of conscience under the belief of orthodoxy, must necessarily be much more severe than under the belief of Universalism. A man dying in the thraldom of iniquity with the firm conviction that everlasting destruction is to be his doom, who can paint or even imagine the torment he must suffer from the goadings and upbraidings of his conscience? But let a man be brought upon a death-bed a firm believer in Universalism (if such a case could be found,) and let him, if you please, be the wickedest man on earth, and where is his remorse of conscience? He has none, as every man who can reason logically must see. He looks back upon his past life and concludes that notwithstanding he had done many things that people looked upon as wrong, yet God had decreed them and hence they were virtually right, as they would all certainly be overruled for good. And the thoughts of sin being such a harmless thing as only to affect him in this short life, and even here not enough to cause the loss of a minute's sleep on its account; and in addition to this, the thoughts of being transported in a few minutes from the dominion of pain and sickness into the gardens of fadeless beauty and the realms of uninterrupted bliss would drive remorse as far from his conscience as the east is from the west! And if the doctrine of Universalism, as its advocates are compelled to admit, will let a man die in his sins and die *happy*, will it not also on the same principle cause a wicked man to live in his sins and at the same time go on his way *rejoicing*? In what, then, consists the moral power of Universalism? The rankest system of Deism has in it every feature of *moral restraint* connected with Universalism, and at the same time

does not hold out such infinite inducements to prompt men to practice iniquity as does the system we are opposing, as will be shown in another chapter. As a philosopher or philanthropist I should feel myself bound to preach unadulterated Deism in preference to Universalism.

But what benefit, in point of punishment, do Universalists expect their doctrine will be to men in general? Cannot a sinner feel the compunctions of conscience until a Universalist preacher tells him how badly his conscience will hurt him if he does wrong? If not, then for nearly eighteen hundred years of the Christian dispensation, before Hosea Ballou made his important discovery, there was no punishment for sin. But if sinners can feel the sting of remorse just as sensibly without understanding the theory of Universalism as with it, then where is the necessity of preaching the doctrine? It saves no one from punishment. It holds forth no punishment except that which the sinner naturally understood just as well before. It takes no one to heaven, and saves no one in any sense, except the preacher perhaps from pecuniary want! We strongly suspect that the power of Universalism is not so much moral as financial!

But the great truth relative to this whole subject, and one which Universalists appear to have entirely ignored is, that remorse of conscience or anguish of mind arises from the fear of God. Accordingly, in proportion to the extent that a man fears God will be his guilt of conscience when he commits a sin; and if a man has become utterly destitute of fear, he must necessarily have no remorse let him do what he will. Now all that is necessary in order to complete this argument is to show that some men are destitute of fear. The apostle in speaking of wicked men says: "Their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known, there is *no fear of God before their eyes.*" [Rom. 3. 15–18.] Such characters must necessarily be destitute of remorse and hence if the guilt of conscience be the punishment for sin, then Universalists are bound to admit, not only that myriads of wicked men go to heaven without any punishment, but that all a man has to do to get clear of punishment is to persevere in the practice of iniquity until he becomes so wicked as to have no fear of God before his eyes. Then he is clear of all remorse and consequently of all punishment, if Universalism be true. And as this doctrine teaches that God is a being who is not to be *feared*, it follows that no man will fear God if he believes in Universalism, and hence let this be the prevailing doctrine and remorse of conscience will come to a perpetual end.

But another difficulty in the way of this theory will be seen in the fact that the scriptures everywhere teach that *God* is to punish the sinner; but according to this doctrine the *sinner* punishes *himself* by stirring up his conscience, and thus the Lord has no hand in the matter. The Psalmist says, that "the wicked shall be turned into

hell." [Ps. 9. 17.] If a guilty conscience be the hell threatened against the wicked, then the only way the wicked can be turned into hell, as the Indian told the Universalist, is to be turned wrong side out! If the punishment for sin be no more than the compunctions of conscience, and if, as Universalism teaches, sinners are bound to suffer all the punishment that their sins deserve, I see not what need we have of a Saviour; for a man's conscience, according to this theory, is his God, his hell and his Saviour, and could have answered every purpose of atonement as well without the death and sufferings of Christ as with them.

It is certainly a most singular and unaccountable fact that all the fearful denunciations and threatenings of the Bible against sinners are no more than a little remorse of conscience which nine-tenths of the wicked would rather endure eternally than go to heaven! The "everlasting destruction,"—"lake of fire and brimstone,"—"second death,"—"eternal damnation,"—"fiery indignation,"—"everlasting punishment," "day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," etc., etc., are all, according to Universalism, inside of the sinner, and strange to tell, more than one half of them don't know it, and don't care for it if they did!

Universalism teaches that this present time is all the day of judgment there is or ever will be. But is it not most remarkably singular that hundreds and thousands have lived all their lives in the practice of wickedness and have died and gone into eternity without having the least suspicion that they had passed through the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men; but were always looking for it ahead! If a Universalist had told them that they were then in the lake of fire and brimstone suffering the everlasting destruction and eternal damnation of which the scriptures speak, they would have laughed at them. What! we suffering everlasting punishment in the fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and not feel it? Away with such nonsense! It must be admitted by all that the penalties annexed to the laws of God should be as much severer than those inflicted in any human government, righteously administered, as the laws of God are superior to those of man. And there must necessarily be as much difference between the laws of God and the laws of man as between the authorities by which they are established and administered. Now suppose the laws and penalties of a State government to be such that a criminal for the vilest offense could be arraigned before the judgment seat,—tried,—condemned, sentenced,—and executed,—and never know that any thing had happened to him! What would such a government come to? Would it lead the abandoned profligate to fear and tremble at the calamity that would come upon him, which would be so terrible that he would pass through it all, and never know that any thing had hurt him?

Again: It is a fact worthy of observation that men may become so wicked that they will experience more anguish of mind when they

do *right* than when they do wrong. Mark that miser in his wealth which he has wrung from the tears of widows and orphans. The poor are crushed beneath his feet, and those from whom he had wrenched the last farthing of their earthly support are thrown upon the charity of a merciless world, whilst their cruel oppressor is feasting upon luxuries, though strange as it may appear, he is all the time in hell torment, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, and has never lost an hour's sleep on that account! Whilst he thinks of nothing except hoarding up gold and silver, he rests contented; but when he receives intelligence that he must restore to the poor their earnings which he had kept back by fraud, his countenance changes, sleep flees from his eyelids, and he pines under sorrow and distress. But what's wrong? Why, the fellow has to do that which is lawful and right, and it breaks his heart, and almost grieves him to death!

But another point; conscience cannot be a minister of justice from the fact that it is more severe under some circumstances than others, even when the crimes are exactly the same. For example: a practical highway robber murders a man for his money. He has followed the business for years, and has become so habituated to cruelty that his conscience no longer upbraids him; and he has no more remorse for murdering a man, if he is certain it will not be divulged, than for killing an animal. Accordingly he covers his crime in such a manner as to preclude all possibility of discovery, and he is seen in the streets as little conscience-smitten as though his hands were pure from the blood of all men. But suppose just as he had perpetrated this deed, he should be discovered, arrested, and brought to justice, and should hear his sentence to hang by the neck till he was dead. He is then thrust into prison to await the awful crisis. The terror and dismay that now take possession of his bosom, and the fearful forebodings that await him can be imagined but never described. His conscience, which so long had slumbered, is now aroused, and lashes the wretch with scorpion stings of guilt, whilst within him is kindled a fire of the keenest anguish! But all this suffering, let it be observed, resulted from the mere accident of his arrest. Had not this circumstance occurred, he would, as a matter of course, have escaped all this torture; and had he, at some future period have fallen instantly dead, he would, according to Universalism, have escaped all punishment, and as no man can be forgiven till he is punished, he would consequently have been launched into eternity in his sins! And as he cannot be punished there if this doctrine be true, he must therefore remain in his sins eternally, and consequently remain eternally under the sentence of condemnation! This is the logical result, admitting the truth of this doctrine relative to the compunctions of conscience.

But the scriptures clearly teach that the wicked fare better in this world than the righteous. Look at the afflictions and persecutions of the righteous, enumerated by the apostle in the 11th of Hebrews,

"And others had trials of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword, they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being *destitute*, *afflicted*, and *tormented*." [Heb. 11. 36. 37.] The Psalmist declares; "Many are the *afflictions* of the *righteous*." [Ps. 34. 19.] But how is it with the wicked? The Psalmist shall answer: "For I was envious at the foolish when I saw the *prosperity of the wicked*. They are not in *trouble as other men* [*righteous* men of course,] neither are they plagued like other men. Their eyes stand out with fatness, they have more that heart could wish. They are corrupt and speak wickedly concerning oppression, they speak loftily: they set their mouth against the heavens. Behold these are the ungodly who prosper in the world." [Ps. 73. 3, 5, 9, 12.] It is true, as says the prophet, that the wicked, before their consciences became seared, are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waves cast up mire and dirt, and also that there is no peace to the wicked whilst in this condition. But it is also true that when the wicked become conscience-seared and past feeling remorse, they "have *pleasure in unrighteousness*." [2 Thes. 2. 12.] It is true that they "*enjoy the pleasures of sin*." [Heb. 11. 25.] It is true that they "*count it pleasure* to *riot* in the day-time,—*sporting themselves* with their own deceiving." [2 Pet. 2. 13.] It is true that they "have *lived in pleasure* upon the earth, and been *wanton*," and that they are "lovers of *pleasure* more than lovers of God." [Jam. 5. 5. 2 Tim. 3. 4.] It is true that with such characters "*wickedness is sweet*," and "their *rejoicing* is to *devour the poor secretly*." [Job. 20. 12. Hab. 3. 14.] It is true that "*they delight in lies*,"—that "their *soul delighteth in their abominations*," that "they *rejoice to do evil*," and that they "not only do the same, but *have pleasure* in them that do them." [Ps. 62. 4. Is. 66. 3. Prov. 2. 14. Rom. 1. 32.] And it is true "that there be just men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked: again there be wicked men to whom it happeneth, according to the work of the righteous." [Eccl. 8. 14.] Thus we discover that the righteous in this world are compelled to endure all manner of afflictions and privations; and many times to receive the reward due for the works of the wicked; whilst the wicked *rejoice* to do evil, *delight* in lies and abominations,—and have *pleasure* in unrighteousness! If this be the manner in which God rewards the righteous for their good deeds, and punishes the wicked for their evil deeds, then no rational man can look upon the moral government of God as anything better than a system of cruelty and injustice.

But finally, we take the position that compunctions of conscience, let them be experienced to any extent, are not punishment at all; and that Universalists must therefore admit that the wicked are punished in the future state of existence, or else deny divine punishment *in toto, and* thus strip the disguise from their doctrine, and

give us what we ought to have had long ago,—*infidelity unmasked.*

There is a difference between the punishment for sin and the natural effect of sin; and more than this, the natural or immediate effects of sin, are no where in the Bible spoken of as the punishment which sin deserves. We shall present several arguments to prove that compunctions or remorse of conscience are not the punishment for, but the natural or legitimate effects of, sin.

The Jew, who broke the Sabbath by picking up sticks had, doubtless, as much remorse of conscience or anguish of mind as any man can have now for violating God's law, yet this was not his punishment,—he had to be stoned to death,—die without mercy under two or three witnesses. This was called "a just recompense of reward." [Heb. 2. 2.]—Does God, at this time, punish sinners only with compunctions of conscience when, three thousand years ago, he inflicted all that and more than three thousand times as much? Can God do this and be immutable? The truth is, remorse of conscience was no punishment then, neither is it now. If it is, then God is a respecter of persons, a position which the apostle denies. There have occurred only a few cases of divine punishment under the Christian dispensation, such as the death of Herod when the angel of the Lord smote him, and that of Ananias and Sophira. [Acts 5. 5–10, 12, 23.] But did not these individuals experience as much remorse of conscience as do other sinners? And is it not frequently the case that sinners die suddenly upon their beds, whilst unconscious in slumber, and thus go into eternity without a groan or struggle? Such cases frequently occur. Now if remorse of conscience be punishment, and if the doctrine of Universalism be true, then God is a respecter of persons, and punished Herod, Ananias, and Sophira unjustly. If not, then Universalists are bound to admit, according to their own logic, that remorse of conscience is not punishment, and that the wicked who now go into eternity with nothing but the trifling upbraidings of a guilty conscience which many of them suffer, will receive their just deserts at the day of judgment and the perdition of ungodly men; and in admitting this, they will agree with the apostle that "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." [2 Pet. 2. 9.]

When Christ said: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," he referred, according to Universalism to the Jews being driven away into captivity at the destruction of their city. Well, if they were then driven away into punishment, it proves that remorse of conscience was not punishment, for they had this as much as other sinners, long before their dispersion.

God has frequently threatened men that he would punish them for their sins after a certain lapse of time when, according to Universalism, he was punishing them all the while and they did not know it, and neither did God!

But it may be thought that the peace of mind which a righteous man has is his reward, and upon the same principle the anguish of mind which the wicked suffer is their punishment. Yes, one is just as rational as the other; but neither of them is true. Isaiah tells us that "the *effect* of righteousness, is *quietness*;" [Is. 32. 17.] and the Saviour instead of teaching his disciples that they received their reward *in their consciences*, points their minds forward: "Great is your reward *in heaven*," and taught those who performed acts of kindness and benevolence in calling in to their feasts the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind, that they should be "recompensed at the resurrection of the just," and not that their recompense was the effect that those benevolent acts had upon their own consciences!

Sin may produce many effects, and we have a right to infer one effect to be punishment for sin as well as another. Let us see. Suppose you get in a passion and strike your neighbor with a deadly weapon. It has produced two effects: your conscience goads you and your neighbor is severly wounded. Now which effect is the punishment for this sin? Not the one produced upon the wounded man; for that would be punishing him for your offense. This being true, there is no proof that the other effect is punishment either. If you think there is, then look at another case. Suppose you strike that man with your fist instead of a deadly weapon—the result is the man gets a moderate bruise, but by accident you break your arm. In this case you did not commit as great a crime as in the other; yet you have to suffer inconceivably more! You not only have the lashings of a guilty conscience, but the additional pain of a broken arm. If the effect of sin be the punishment for sin, then which of these effects is the punishment? If either of them is, then they both are; for it would be the extremity of nonsense to contend that the effect upon the mind was punishment while the effect upon the body was not? But suppose they are both punishment; then the remorse of conscience which you experienced as an effect of the first crime was not just punishment, or else the two effects produced by the second crime were more than justice demanded! But as Universalists contend that remorse of conscience is the full demand of justice, it follows that the other effect cannot be punishment, and hence neither is, as we have seen that one of these effects cannot be punishment unless both are!

There is another substantial reason that can be assigned why remorse of conscience, or anguish of mind, is not the punishment which God inflicts for sin. It is a truth which Universalists themselves admit, that God never punishes the sinner after he forgives him. Now look at the case of Mr. W. who, in a state of intoxication murdered his brother. In an instant is laid dead at his feet the husband of a confiding wife and the father of six lovely children. No mortal can paint the grief of that bereaved family. The man awakes *from his drunkenness* and beholds the crime he has perpetrated.

He looks upon that heart-broken widow and those bereaved orphans whose cries pierce the wretch to the inmost recesses of his heart. Had he ten thousand worlds he would give them all could he but undo that dreadful act. But alas, it is too late! That deed cannot be recalled, and its effects must remain, not only upon that afflicted family, but also upon the heart of that unfortunate wretch as long as life shall last. Although he may reform his life and become a Christian, and consequently will have his sins forgiven; yet that effect remains; and although God has, as a matter of course, ceased to punish him if he ever punished him at all; still that anguish of soul remains; and at every sight of that distressed family, whose happiness he had destroyed for life, his sweetest reflections are mingled with the bitter dregs of sorrow and regret! This proves beyond all controversy that the effect which sin produces even upon the mind of the sinner, is not the punishment for his sins; for none dare to contend that God will punish a man for his sins after those sins are forgiven!

Having thus shown that there cannot be such a thing as remorse of conscience experienced by any true believer in Universalism,—that the theory of conscience-punishment exhibits the most positive injustice,—that it holds out the strongest conceivable inducements to encourage the sinner to persevere in his wickedness in order to get beyond punishment by becoming conscience-seared,—that the wicked do absolutely prosper more in a worldly point of view than the righteous, and that they enjoy pleasure in unrighteousness,—and finally, that remorse of conscience, or anguish of mind is not punishment for sin in any sense of the word; consequently we aver that Universalists do not believe in punishment at all!

## CHAPTER VIII.

### TESTIMONY OF ONE HUNDRED WITNESSES.

"*Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error.*"—1 John 4. 6.

1. Bible: "If any man serve me let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be." [John 12. 26.]
   Universalism: Where Christ is there shall also the servant of the devil be as well.
2. Bible: "Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." [Acts 3. 19.]
   Universalism: Your sins shall be blotted out whether you repent and be converted or not.
3. Bible: "Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book." [Rev. 22. 7.]
   Universalism: The man who disobeys every word in this book is just as certain of being *blessed* as the most obedient man on earth.
4. Bible: "If any man serve me him will my Father honor." [John 12. 26.]
   Universalism: If any man serve the devil all his life him will the Father honor with a seat at his own right hand, for all shall be made holy and happy.
5. Bible: "The world passeth away and the lusts thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." [1 John 2. 17.]
   Universalism: There is to be no difference in the outcome between them who do the will of God, and those who do the will of the devil.
6. Bible: "That ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer." [2 Thes. 1. 5.]
   Universalism: All shall be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, whether they suffer for it or not.
7. Bible: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even *weeping*, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction." [Phil. 3. 18, 19.]
   Universalism: For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even *laughing*, that although they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, yet their end is *salvation*.
8. Bible: "And being made perfect, he became the author of *eternal salvation*, to all them that *obey* him." [Heb. 5. 9.]
   Universalism: And being made perfect he became the author of *eternal salvation* to all them that *disobey* him.

**9.** Bible: "Wherefore my beloved brethren:—*work out* your salvation with fear and trembling." [Phil. 2. 12.]

Universalism: Wherefore my beloved brethren, you shall all have salvation whether you work it out or not. And as for fearing and trembling there is no necessity for it, as you are certain of final salvation, let you do what you will.

**10.** Bible: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." [Mark 16. 16.]

Universalism: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not *shall be.*

**11.** Bible: "To the weak became I as weak that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means *save some.*" [1 Cor. 9. 22.]

Universalism: What was all that for Paul? when all were certain of salvation (not *some*) without all that trouble.

**12.** Bible: "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." [Heb. 4. 9.]

Universalism: There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of the *devil* as well as to the people of God, because the final rest is for all.

**13.** Bible: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation and reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." [2 Pet. 2. 9.]

Universalism: The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the unjust unto the resurrection to be *saved.*

**14.** Bible: "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God and he shall be my son." [Rev. 21. 7.]

Universalism: He that does *not* overcome shall inherit all things just as much, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son even if he live and die as wicked as Nero.

**15.** Bible: "For this ye know that no whoremonger nor unclean person nor covetous man who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." [Eph. 5. 5.]

Universalism: For this ye know, that all whoremongers and unclean persons and all covetous idolaters are just as certain of an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God as they are certain of being raised from the dead.

**16.** Bible: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." [Rev. 22. 14.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that do not his commandments, for they shall have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city.

**17.** Bible: "When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." [Jam. 1. 15.]

Universalism: Lust when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin,

and sin when it is finished bringeth forth eternal life, since the sooner a man is dead the sooner he will be in heaven.

**18.** Bible: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." [Math. 5. 7.]

Universalism: Blessed are the *unmerciful*, for they shall obtain *mercy*.

**19.** Bible: "Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." [Luke 11. 28.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and disobey it.

**20.** Bible: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." [Math. 5. 6.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that *do not* hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall also be filled.

**21.** Bible: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." [Math. 5. 5.]

Universalism: Blessed are the wicked, for they shall inherit heaven.

**22.** Bible: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." [Math. 5. 3.]

Universalism: Blessed are the *proud* in spirit, for theirs is heaven itself.

**23.** Bible: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." [Math 5. 4.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that mock God and revile Christ, for they shall be comforted.

**24.** Bible: "Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the children of God." [Math. 5. 9.]

Universalism: Blessed are the quarrelsome, for they shall also be called the children of God.

**25.** Bible: "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, lor theirs is the kingdom of heaven." [Math. 5. 10.]

Universalism: Blessed are those who persecute the righteous, for theirs is also the kingdom of heaven whether they repent or not.

**26.** Bible: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." [Math. 5. 8.]

Universalism: Blessed are the impure in heart. for they shall also see God.

**27.** Bible: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." [Rom. 8. 28.]

Universalism: And *we* know that all things will work together (and be overruled) for good to all men, whether they love God or not.

**28.** Bible: "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life." [John 3. 36.]

*Universalism:* He that believeth not the Son, shall see eternal life *which is provided* for all.

**29.** Bible: "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." [2 Cor. 5. 11.]

Universalism: Knowing therefore that God will save every body, we let them do just as they please.

**30.** Bible: "I press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." [Phil. 3. 14.]

Universalism: I will not press toward the mark for the prize; as I am just as sure of it without *pressing* as I am with it.

**31.** Bible: "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed." [2 Pet. 2. 12.]

Universalism: These, although as natural brute beasts, are nevertheless made to be taken and saved with an everlasting salvation.

**32.** Bible: "Blessed is the man that *endureth temptation*, for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." [James 1. 12.]

Universalism: Blessed is the man that *does not* endure temptation, for whether he is tried or not he shall receive a crown of life which the Lord has promised to them that *hate* him; just as much as to them that love him.

**33.** Bible: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." [Rom. 1. 16.]

Universalism: I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for all that are not saved by this means will be saved by some other; and hence we are safe anyhow.

**34.** Bible: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." [Rom. 10. 9.]

Universalism: If thou shalt deny with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and disbelieve in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, and even die in this condition, still thou shalt be saved.

**35.** Bible: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me: and ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." [John 5. 39, 40.]

Universalism: You shall all have eternal life and be saved whether you come unto Christ or not.

**36.** Bible: "With the merciful, thou wilt show thyself merciful." [Ps. 18. 25.]

Universalism: With the unmerciful thou wilt show thyself merciful.

**37.** Bible: "From men of the world which have their portion in *this life*." [Ps. 17. 14.]

Universalism: The men of the world have as great a portion in the next life as any other men.

**38.** Bible: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death." [Prov. 14. 32.]

Universalism: The righteous have no more hope in his death than

the wicked, that is, if the wicked only understand Universalism, for all are equally safe after they die.

**39.** Bible : "When the wicked spring up as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed forever." [Ps. 22. 7.]

Universalism; When the wicked spring up as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish it is that they may be saved forever.

**40.** Bible : "The wicked shall be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God." [Ps. 9. 17.]

Universalism : The wicked shall be turned into *heaven* with all the nations that forget God.

**41.** Bible : "He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed and that *without remedy.*" [Prov. 29. 1.]

Universalism : He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be saved and that without injury. Or, if he be destroyed in his sins, it is not without remedy, for the resurrection will prove an effectual panacea.

**42.** Bible: "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace." [Ps. 37. 37.]

Universalism: Mark the imperfect man, and behold the downright sinner, for the *end* of that man is peace and salvation.

**43.** Bible: "But the transgressors shall be destroyed together ; the end of the wicked shall be cut off." [Ps. 37. 38.]

Universalism : But the transgressors shall be saved together ; the end of the wicked shall be eternal life.

**44.** Bible: "Precious in the sight of the Lord, is the death of his saints." [Ps. 116. 15.]

Universalism : Precious in the sight of the Lord, is the death of his sinners; for they are all his and will be saved together: hence the death of sinners is equally precious in the sight of the Lord with the death of saints.

**45.** Bible: "To him that ordereth his conversation aright, will I show the salvation of God." [Ps. 50. 23.]

Universalism : To him that does not order his conversation at all or that orders it wrong, will I show the salvation of God.

**46.** Bible: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." [Rom. 10. 13.]

Universalism : They shall be saved, whether they call upon the Lord or not, or if they die blaspheming his holy name.

**47.** Bible: "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." [1 Cor. 1. 21.]

Universalism: It will please God without preaching, to save them that do not believe.

**48.** Bible : "Whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of *sins." [Ac. 10. 43.]*

Universalism: All mankind shall ultimately have remission of sins, whether they believe on Christ or not. For they are all to be saved, and they can't be saved in their sins.

**49.** Bible: "In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." [Ac. 10. 35.]

Universalism: In every nation, he that feareth not God, and worketh unrighteousness, is accepted with him.

**50.** Bible: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." [Rom. 5. 14.]

Universalism: As many as are led by the spirit of the devil, they are also the sons of God.

**51.** Bible: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." [Math. 11. 28.]

Universalism: Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, or stay away from me whichever you please, and I will give you rest in heaven.

**52.** Bible: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, and ye shall find rest to your souls." [Ibid. 29.]

Universalism: You shall find rest to your souls if you never learn of Christ, and if you utterly refuse to take his yoke upon you.

**53.** Bible: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." [Ac. 2. 38.]

Universalism: You shall have remission of sins without repentance, baptism, or any act of obedience whatever, and even if you curse God and die.

**54.** Bible: "What must I do to be saved?" [Ac. 16. 30.]

Universalism: Answer: Nothing at all, as you are sure of salvation any how.

**55.** Bible: "Are there *few* that be saved?" [Luke 13. 23.]

Universalism: Answer: Not a few, but *all.*"

**56.** Bible: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" [1 Cor. 6. 9.]

Universalism: Answer: No, I did not know it.

**57.** Bible: "What is a man advantaged if he should gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away?" [Luke 9. 25.]

Universalism: Answer: He would be cast into heaven, and there he would find himself, so that it would be a great advantage in the outcome for a man to lose himself and be cast away.

**58.** Bible: "Good Master: what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" [Math 19. 16.]

Universalism: No good thing at all, sir, as you shall have it any how.

**59.** Bible: "What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" [1 Pet. 4. 17.]

Universalism: Answer: Their end shall be everlasting salvation.

**60.** Bible: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" [Matthew 16. 26.]

Universalism: Answer: He shall gain his own soul back again; and get immortality and eternal life besides.

**61.** Bible: "If the righteous scarcely be saved where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" [1 Pet. 4. 18.]

Universalism: Answer: They shall appear in the presence of God where there is fullness of joy, and at his right hand where there are pleasures forever more.

**62.** Bible: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" [Heb. 2. 3.]

Universalism: Answer: Easy enough; by slipping the halter around our necks and swinging into paradise.

**63.** Bible: "Woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation." [Luke 6. 24.]

Universalism: Blessed are you that are rich, for you shall have an abundance of consolation in the next world besides all you have in this.

**64.** Bible: "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." [Math. 5. 12.]

Universalism: You need not rejoice, expecting a reward in heaven which is free alike to all; for the reward you will get for doing right will be here on earth.

**65.** Bible: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him." [Heb. 7. 25.]

Universalism: Wherefore he is able *also* to save to the uttermost those that *will not* come unto God at all just as easily as those that will come.

**66.** Bible: "We pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." [2 Cor. 5. 20.]

Universalism: We inform you by the authority of Christ, that if ye will not be reconciled to God, you shall be any how; for he is going to reconcile all things unto himself whether they are willing or not.

**67.** Bible: "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." [Rom. 2. 13.]

Universalism: The hearers of the law, the doers of the law, and the *breakers* of the law, shall all be justified together, and one class is as sure of it as another.

**68.** Bible: "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat." [Math. 7. 13.]

Universalism: Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leads to *glory*, and none there are who will not go in thereat.

**69.** Bible: "For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one *to come.*" *[Heb. 13. 14.]*

Universalism: Here have we no continuing city, but we shall have one to come whether we seek for it or not.

**70.** Bible: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." [Math. 25. 41.]

Universalism: Through this "everlasting fire," which was at the destruction of Jerusalem, the "*cursed*" shall depart safely into *everlasting glory.*

**71.** Bible: "Little children let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous." [1 John 3. 7.]

Universalism: Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth unrighteousness shall be as certainly righteous at the resurrection as though he did righteousness all his life.

**72.** Bible: "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." [Math. 6. 20.]

Universalism: What is the use of this? You shall all have treasures in heaven, whether you lay up any there or not.

**73.** Bible: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." [Math. 10. 32.]

Universalism: Whosoever therefore shall deny me before men, and shall die in the very act of blaspheming my name; him will I also confess as an heir of salvation before my Father in heaven.

**74.** Bible: "Wherefore come out from among them saith the Lord, —and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." [2. Cor. 6. 17.]

Universalism: Stay in among them saith the Lord, and touch all the unclean things on earth, and I will receive you as freely as though you should abstain from all appearance of evil.

**75.** Bible: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." [Acts 16. 31.]

Universalism: Believe on Mohammed, or the devil; or believe nothing at all and you shall be saved!

**76.** Bible: "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." [Math. 6. 15.]

Universalism: If ye forgive not men their trespasses, and die with your hearts full of hatred and malice toward your fellow mortals, your heavenly Father will, notwithstanding, forgive your trespasses, or take you to heaven in your sins, one or the other, for all are certain of salvation.

**77.** Bible: "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." [Rom. 8. 9.]

Universalism: All men are Christ's, whether they have his Spirit or not.

**78.** Bible: "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." [Gal. 3. 9.]

Universalism : So then they which are unbelievers, and die Atheists, are as certain of being blessed with Abraham as the most faithful men on earth.

**79.** Bible: "Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." [Acts 11. 14.]

Universalism: He, and all his house could have been saved just as well without those words as with them.

**80.** Bible: "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." [Rom. 10. 10.]

Universalism : Salvation is absolutely certain without confessing with the mouth, and without any other act of obedience.

**81.** Bible : "Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." [Jam. 4. 10.]

Universalism : Exalt yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he will lift you up at the resurrection.

**82.** Bible: "Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him." [Is. 3. 11.]

Universalism : Peace unto the wicked, it shall be as well with him in the end as with the righteous.

**83.** Bible: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." [Num. 23. 10.]

Universalism: The last end of the righteous is no better than the last end of the wicked. They are exactly alike."

**84.** Bible: "To present you holy, and unblamable, and unreprovable in his sight, *if* ye continue in the faith." [Col. 1. 23.]

Universalism : You shall all be presented holy, and unblamable, and unreprovable in the sight of God, if you deny the faith and become worse than infidels.

**85.** Bible: "If a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully." [2 Tim. 2. 5.]

Universalism: All men will be crowned with immortality, if they strive unlawfully or if they strive not at all.

**86.** Bible : "So run that ye may obtain." [1 Cor. 9. 24."]

Universalism : All mankind shall obtain the incorruptible crown if they never run a step.

**87.** Bible : "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins ; whither I go ye cannot come." [John 8. 21.]

Universalism: Your dying in your sins will make no difference, for whither I go (that is to heaven) you shall all certainly come.

**88.** Bible: "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord." [Rev. 14. 13.]

Universalism : Blessed are the dead that die in their sins.

**89.** Bible : "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the *humble*." [Jam. 4. 6.]

Universalism: God will bless the proud and give grace to the wicked, as all such shall be saved at the resurrection.

**90** Bible: "And shall utterly perish in their own corruption." [2 Pet. 2. 12.]

Universalism: They shall be eternally saved out of all their corruption even if they die in it.

**91.** Bible; "Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you." [Jas. 4. 8.]

Universalism: God will draw nigh to you and save you whether you draw nigh to him or not.

**92.** Bible. "Be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace without spot and blameless." [2 Pet. 3. 14.]

Universalism: You shall all be found of him in peace, and shall not be blamed however spotted with sin.

**93.** Bible: "To declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." [Rom. 3. 26.]

Universalism: God would be unjust and cruel, did he not justify unbelievers and save all without exception.

**94.** Bible: "*If* we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to for, give us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." [1 John 1. 9.]

Universalism: If we will not confess our sins, yet he would be unjust if he did not forgive them; and he will ultimately cleanse us from all unrighteousness let us do the very worst we can.

**95.** Bible: "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." [1 Pet. 5. 6.]

Universalism: God will exalt you in due time to a seat in glory, just as much without humbling yourselves as with, for the proud and the meek shall be saved and exalted to the same station at the resurrection.

**96.** Bible: "Shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of Spirits and live?" [Heb. 12. 9.]

Universalism: We shall all live, anyhow, and that too in endless felicity, whether we are in subjection to the Father of Spirits or not.

**97.** Bible: "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live." [Rom. 8. 13.]

Universalism: If ye live after the flesh, God doth know that *ye shall not surely die*, and if ye through the spirit of the devil do gratify the deeds of the body ye shall live at God's right hand.

**98.** Bible: "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." [Jude 13.]

Universalism: Those raging waves of the sea are rolling on toward heaven, and to those wandering stars is reserved the blissful presence of God and the Lamb forever.

**99.** Bible: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." [2 Pet. 1. 10.]

Universalism: You need give no diligence concerning your election, for that is unalterably fixed, as the whole human family are unconditionally elected for eternal life let them do as they may. No man therefore can make his election any surer by giving diligence.

**100.** Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophesy, and *keep those things that are written therein.*" [Rev. 1. 3.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that *will not read*,—that *will not hear*, and that *will not keep* the commandments which are written in this book; for they shall all be made like unto the angels of God, whether they are counted worthy to obtain that world or not.

## CHAPTER IX.

### DEBATE ON THE PERFECTIONS AND ATTRIBUTES OF DEITY.

BETWEEN ALPHA AND OMEGA.

*"Canst thou by Searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to Perfection?*—Job 11. 7.

[The following is a fair representation of the arguments adduced in the discussion referred to, in which the author took part. We express no opinion with regard to the merits of the discussion but let each reader decide for himself, after giving the matter a careful examination.]

### ALPHA'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

A question of deep and thrilling interest is about to elicit the attention of this intelligent audience: "Can Universal Salvation be proved from the attributes of God?" This is the question, and, as you perceive, your present speaker takes the affirmative. I profess to advocate the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, irrespective of conditions to be performed in this life. I feel strong in the question now pending, knowing the tenableness of the ground I occupy. I take the attributes and perfections of Deity as my exclusive source of evidence in this controversy; not, however, giving up the direct teaching of the scriptures in favor of universal salvation.

I start out upon the admitted position that God is unchangeable, the same yesterday, to-day and forever, without variableness or shadow of turning. This is the chief corner stone of the edifice I am about to erect; and as this is not only an axiomatic position, but one which my opponent will not call in question; I feel as though I had dug deep and laid my foundation upon a rock. I have no faith in *limitarianism*, as I take the liberty of terming the orthodox belief; for I believe that God is infinite in power, wisdom and goodness. The scriptures are plain and positive upon this point, and as my friend will no doubt admit it, there is no necessity for quoting much scripture. One of the principle sins of the children of Israel in the wilderness was, that they "limited the Holy One of Israel." [Ps. 78. 41.] Our opponents are daily guilty of committing the same sin; but we are not *limitarians*. We believe with the Saviour that "with God all things are possible." [Math. 19. 26.] Hence it is possible for God to save all men; and we shall endeavor to prove from several considerations, before we close the present investigation, that such will be the glorious result. Before taking my seat (as I wish at present

merely to open the discussion,) I will present one direct, and as I think unanswerable argument, in favor of my position. God must have known before he created man what would be his destiny: and if he created him, knowing at the same time that he would be eternally lost, he must have willed his destruction, and as God's will is that all shall be saved, he must have created none, therefore, only such as he knew would be saved; and if he had foreseen that any one of his intelligent creatures would be finally lost, his omnipotence could, and his benevolence therefore would, have withheld his existence! Here is my first argument, and I confess in all frankness that I am unable to see how it can be met. In the meantime I will hear what can be said in reply.

## OMEGA'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE:

I feel truly the importance of the day's labor before us, and concur heartily with my friend, that this is a question of momentous importance; that is, provided I am on the right side of the question; but if my friend should succeed in proving his side to be the true ground, it is of but little consequence whether the question be debated or not; for it can be the means of saving no one, as all are as certain of salvation without this discussion as they can be with it. But if it be demonstrated that I occupy the correct ground, it may be the means of some person fleeing for refuge and laying hold on the hope set before him, who would otherwise have rested in the false security of a delusive error, thinking that all is safe and certain with respect to the future; and as regards the present short life it is but little difference. Hence the importance of this day's occasion is suspended mainly upon the fact of my side of the question being correct.

I agree with my friend with regard to the unchangeableness of God; but he will find this a poor support for Universalism, and may possibly be glad to take it back before this discussion comes to a close and wish that God were changeable! He is quite liberal in dealing out the term *limitarian*, and charging us with the sin of *limiting* the Holy One of Israel; and yet, in almost the same breath, he commences telling us what God *must* do and what he *must not* do! We shall see, doubtless, before long, who have best claims to the charge of *limitarianism*, they or us. My friend has been so long in the habit of garbling the word of God, that he cannot debate the present question without garbling also God's attributes. He takes *power*, *wisdom* and *goodness*, and says nothing about *justice* and *vengeance*. These five attributes should not be separated but taken together, as they are all necessary to the harmonious operations of the moral government of God. They each have a list of names in the scriptures signifying nearly the same thing, and are frequently used by *inspired writers* interchangeably. When classified they stand thus:

1. *Power:* To this belong "*omnipotence,*" "*might,*" "*strength,*" and "*ability!*"

2. *Wisdom:* —— "*knowledge,*" "*understanding,*" "*perception,*" and "*discernment!*"

3. *Goodness:* —— "*loving-kindness,*" "*mercy,*" "*long-suffering,*" "*compassion,*" "*pity,*" and "*benevolence.*"

4. *Justice:* ——"*righteousness,*" *equity,*" "*judgment,*" "*truth,*" and "*faithfulness.*"

5. *Vengeance:* —— "*wrath,*" "*indignation,*" "*hatred,*" "*anger,*" "*severity,*" "*jealousy,*" and "*fury.*"

This fifth list is a stranger to my opponent's creed. I doubt exceedingly whether he has any faith in it at all, notwithstanding vengeance is more exclusively God's attribute than either of the other four; for whilst power, wisdom, goodness and justice are attributes of God, they are, at the same time, attributes of man; and essentially necessary for him to possess in order to comply with the demands of God's law. The relation which he sustains to God and to his fellow-men requires that he should possess to some extent the attributes of power, wisdom, goodness, and justice; but "vengeance is *mine* I will repay saith the Lord." [Rom 12. 19.] The great apostle to the Gentiles has also in the same connection forbidden us to exercise this attribute in any case whatever, because God is the rightful and exclusive possessor of it. I am perfectly willing that my friend should proceed with his arguments; and I have no doubt but that I can prove a universal damnation by the same logic with which he tries to sustain the position he now assumes.

Having thus premised, I now take notice of the argument at the close of my friend's address. The gist of the argument is this: that God must have known before he made man what would be his destiny; and hence if man be finally lost, God wills his destruction; or, in other words, God must *will* or *decree* whatever he foreknows will take place. This being the real ground of my friend, let us look at a few logical conclusions. On that assumption, all manner of theft, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,—all carousing, gambling, drunkenness, profanity, murders, and even blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, are in exact accordance with the will of God; for, according to the premises assumed by my opponent, God *must* have known that all these abominations would be practiced, and hence he *must* have *willed* that they should occur; if not, why did he create those individuals knowing that they would be guilty of such abominations? Yes, the only legitimate conclusion deducible from these premises, is: that all the covetous, proud, boasters, implacable and unmerciful; that all blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, ungodly, profane; that all truce breakers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers, man-stealers, liars, drunkards, sorcerers, and

those that are abominable, disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate, are daily engaged in doing the good, acceptable, and perfect will of God: for, according to Alpha's argument, God must have known what would be their characters, and if he had not *willed* such to be their conduct his omnipotence could, and his benevolence therefore would have prevented their existence! Christ says on one occasion: "Whosoever shall do the *will* of my *Father* in heaven, the same is my mother, and sister, and *brother*." The argument of my friend being correct, what a lovely brotherhood Jesus Christ must possess.

I will wait to hear my opponent either try to mend his old argument or present a new one.

But before taking my seat, I wish definitely to state that it is not my business, neither do I intend, to take any definite position upon this mysterious and unfathomable subject. I simply wish to show my friend that no important theory can be built upon and no certain conclusion can be drawn from such an incomprehensible source as the attributes of God. It is unsafe and presumptuous to risk so much upon such premises.

## ALPHA'S SECOND SPEECH.

Fellow-citizens: It is well for my friend that he made the remark he did just before taking his seat,—that he did not intend to establish any definite positions, but simply to raise difficulties and objections. This we can discover to be his object from the way he reasons. But I have a position to establish, if not beyond quibble, at least beyond successful refutation; and I expect in the main to sustain my ground, let my opponent raise as much dust as he pleases.

As regards the conclusion deduced from my premises, that God *wills* all manner of wickedness, I shall attend to that in due time, and prove that sin must exist according to the will of God, or it could not exist at all. The Rev. Mr. Rogers has argued that point successfully in the *Pro and Con*, a work which we believe never will be successfully answered, in which he has proved that foreknowledge and foreordination imply the same thing; and as God must have foreknown that men would practice wickedness, he must also have foreordained or decreed such to be the fact, but for no other purpose than to be overruled for the good of the sinner. No other view of the matter can harmonize the facts of existence with the infinite mercy of God. This is my faith, as it is the belief of all Universalists east and west. I know of no Universalist preacher who does not believe and preach that God designs to overrule sin, as well as misery, for the good of the transgressor.

As I am just now upon this point, I think it best, probably, to carry the argument a little farther. The truth is, God is the author of sin; not directly, but through the agency of man, who only does what God foreknew and foreordained that he should do. This is *clearly taught* in the Bible. The apostle declares that "*All things*

are of God." [2 Cor. 5. 18.] And the Lord himself declares by the mouth of the prophet: "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and *create evil;* I the Lord do all these things." [Is. 45. 7.] This is sufficient direct proof for the present. God is not only here declared to be the indirect author of sin, but it is here said emphatically, "*I create evil*,"—which is *sin*, and of course one of the *all things*, which the apostle affirms to be "*of God.*" My opponent will find this an exceedingly difficult argument to meet; but I presume he will try to quibble over it in some way.

The apparent difficulty presented at the close of his speech is no difficulty at all. We have a right to reason *a priori*, from what the attributes of God are, to what they will necessarily lead him to do. This is logical and we intend to make good use of it in this discussion. We shall now present what we claim to be an insurmountable argument:—God is infinite in power, wisdom and goodness. 1. His infinite *goodness* would prompt him to desire the endless happiness of the whole human race. 2. His infinite *wisdom* was sufficient to devise means adequate to bring about the end desired; and 3. His infinite *power* was sufficient to carry into effect the means which infinite wisdom had devised, so that the end prompted by infinite goodness will be attained! This argument can also be presented in another form, which will give it perhaps more force. One of three grounds must be admitted;—Either 1. God *can* save all men, but *will not;* or 2. God *will* save all men, but *cannot;* or 3. God *can* and *will* save all men. If you take the first, and say he *can* but *will not*, you limit his goodness. If you take the second and say he *will* but *cannot*, you limit his power; but if you prefer the third, and say he *can* and *will*, you have Universalism, the very thing for which I am contending! The whole argument in favor of universal salvation is based upon the omnipotence of God. What infinite benevolence could have prompted, and infinite knowledge could have devised, infinite power can carry into execution; and thus, in every way it can be turned, universal salvation is the inevitable result. But I have argued the point now till I am almost out of sight of my opponent, and had better rest till he overtakes me! I wish the audience, however, to take particular notice of the manner in which my arguments are met.

## OMEGA'S SECOND REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators: In proceeding with this discussion, I have one suggestion to make, and one favor to ask, since to elicit truth, is the object for which we are here. I do hope that my friend will not present too many points in one speech. I wish to meet every argument, and he, no doubt, is desirous to have the whole ground fairly canvassed; and he should know, as I presume he does, that to rebut an argument requires more time than to present it, admitting the disputants to be equally competent. This, doubtless, will be acceded to.

The audience will remember the conclusions which I deduced from his first argument—that all manner of wickedness and abomination was according to the *will* of God. This, you now perceive, he readily admits, and attempts to justify it by the assumption that God is the author of sin, and that every act a man performs, is in perfect accordance with the immutable decree of Jehovah. This may seem strange ground to many in this audience; but as my opponent remarked, it is the ground of all standard authors on the side of Universalism. Had I not read the same argument in the *Pro and Con*, and some other standard works, I should have been astounded, in hearing, as I conceive, such a pernicious sentiment, thus publicly presented and advocated. But I am not at all taken by surprise. I am fully prepared also as I think for the system in its worst forms. Yes, all that men do, is according to the will of God! Christ says: "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." [Math. 7. 21.] What ridiculous self-contradiction if Universalism be true! No wonder my opponent believes that all will be saved; for. according to his view, let a man do what he will, he is doing the *will* of God, and is consequently certain of the kingdom of heaven. Is it not also unaccountably strange that my friend should reprove a man for getting drunk, as he did the other day, when he knew he was doing the *will* of God,—the very thing that God had decreed or foreordained from all eternity that he should do; and which he could no more have avoided than he could have plucked the moon from her orbit!

God had foreordained or decreed according to this doctrine, that Adam should eat of the forbidden fruit. Then it follows: 1. That God trifled with Adam in trying to keep him from eating when it was his *will* that he should eat. 2. That he acted the part of a cruel tyrant in punishing Adam for doing his will. 3. That the devil was a better friend to God than he was to himself; for whilst God tried to keep Adam from doing his will, the devil persuaded him to do it. And, 4. That God commanded Adam not to eat, and at the same time decreed that he should eat;—thus placing him between the horns of a dilemma, either to break God's *command* or his *decree!*

My friend is strong in the belief that foreknowledge and foreordination imply the same thing; or, that whenever a thing is foreknown it is decreed. We shall attend to this subject more fully by and by; but for the present we shall adduce one argument to show that God has foreknown certain things which he had not decreed. And in the first place, we take it for granted that Christ, whose meet was to do the will of his Father and to do those things that were well-pleasing in his sight, could not labor to break any of his Father's decrees; yet we have an abundance of evidence to prove that he did both desire and labor to prevent a certain transaction from taking place, which *he and his Father* both knew would certainly come to pass, and which

had been predicted by the prophets. I mean the destruction of Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate." [Luke 13. 34, 35.] Thus, Christ labored to prevent the destruction of Jerusalem, which proves that God had not decreed its destruction, although he foreknew and predicted through the prophets that such would be the case.

But "God is the author of sin!" Let us examine this for a few minutes. My opponent quotes in proof of this position: "*All things are of God.*" But all what things? Not all *bad* things, certainly; but all *good* things! The same apostle asserts that charity "*believeth all things.*" [1 Cor. 13. 7.] That is, *all true things;* for no one can suppose that charity believes a lie! Yet, the way my friend argues, we should be led to that very conclusion. But let us see how the Apostle John agrees with my opponent: "All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, *is not of the Father.*" [1 John 2. 16.] Hence, the *all things* which are of God, as I before observed, must be limited to all good things, and hence, does not include sin. "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." [Jam. 1. 17.] Does *sin* come down from the Father of lights? If so, it is a good and perfect gift! "The *fruit of the Spirit* is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." [Gal. 5. 22, 23,], but no mention is made of *sin* in this list of the fruits of the Spirit, and as sin is not of the Spirit, it is not of God, for "God is a Spirit." [John 4. 24.] But sin is a work of the flesh. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past," that they are all *of God?* Nay, verily! My opponent says they are, and would no doubt so translate this verse of scripture; but Paul says: "that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." [Ibid 19. 21.] Thus the apostle contradicts Christ, according to Universalism, by teaching that those who are guilty of the above named list of crimes (which my opponent says is according to the will of God,) shall not inherit he kingdom; and Christ affirms, that those who do the will of God are the very ones who shall be admitted into it! But my friend may urge that God is our Father, and is the author of all that we do. But my Bible informs me that the Father shall not "bear the iniquity of the son." [Ezek. 18. 20.] Yet my friend wishes to throw the blame of all manner of wickedness upon our heavenly Father? We are informed in the scriptures, that "God hath made *man upright.*" [Ec. 7. 29.] Did God make man an upright sinner?

Again we read: "And God saw every thing he had made, and behold it was *very good!*" [Gen. 1. 31.] Is God the author of sin! If so, is sin *very good?* If so, can we think of anything that is very bad?

But God says: "I make peace and *create evil.*" My opponent quotes this as conclusive proof that God is the author of Sin. But what kind of evil does he refer to? Not moral evil, or sin, by any means; but physical evil, such as was threatened against Nineveh. "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way: and God repented of the *evil* that he had said that he would do unto them, and he did it not." [Jonah 3. 10.] Did God repent of the sin he was about to commit against the Ninevites? My opponent no doubt thinks so! But all evil, which God is said to create, we understand to be judgments which he brings upon men for their disobedience. Thus it is said: "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" [Amos 3. 6.] He surely does not mean:—"Shall there be *sin* in a city and the Lord hath not committed it?" What nonsense my friend would make of the Bible!

But he argues that no blame can be attached to the character of God, although the author of all the sin and misery in the universe, from the fact that he designed it for a wise and benevolent purpose, that he might overrule it for good! This is however a bad subterfuge. If God designed to introduce sin, and then to overrule it for the good of the sinner, we may well ask: "Why doth he yet find fault?" Why does he labor to get sin out of existence, since it is designed for a good end? Why does he manifest such displays of wisdom, power and goodness, to do away with his own benevolent design for benefitting the sinner? Why condemn it with such threatenings and denunciations if it be right, and designed to be overruled for good? Why bring such calamities and judgments upon the children of men for being instruments in his hand of doing that only which will result in the greatest amount of good; and which they no more could have avoided than they could have prevented their own existence? Why say "I write unto you little children that you sin not?" when if they did sin, they were only doing the will of God,—the very thing that would be overruled for their good? Why be "angry with the wicked every day?" Why "hate all workers of iniquity?" Why have "no pleasure in wickedness?" Why, let me ask, cannot God look upon sin with the least degree of allowance, since it is his own invention, and calculated not only to add to his own glory, but to result in good to the transgressor? As *sin* is designed for a good end, and will certainly result in good, so that every sinner will be the gainer by it, why does not God command, and encourage his children to practise vice, rather than virtue, that it may increase their happiness by being overruled for their good? Would not a wise and benevolent earthly parent place all the inducements possible before his children to lead them into the path which would re-

sult in their greatest good? If so, would not our heavenly Father manifest more paternal regard for his children if he should encourage wickedness, rather than *curse* men for doing that which they could not help,—which was bound upon them by the decree of Jehovah? I am astonished that my friend could have imbibed such a doctrine: that God would make a man commit sin, and then bring down fire and brimstone upon his head for that which he could not possibly avoid! Like the father who would make his boy drink whisky and then whipped him for getting drunk! What would my opponent think of a man who should knock him down, and then kick him for falling?

But the doctrine which my friend is endeavoring to inculcate is pernicious in its tendency, and is calculated to encourage sinners in the practise of wickedness. It holds out the strongest inducements to commit sin whenever that doctrine is fairly understood. It is an undeniable fact that the more God overrules for our good, the more good we will experience; and as all sin is to be overruled for our good, it follows that the more sin a man commits the better! Sin is preferable to virtue for several considerations, for when a man performs a virtuous act, the good resulting from it he receives as he goes along; but when he commits a sin, and is punished for it, he derives present consolation, from the consciousness that the sin he committed was according to the will of God; and the anticipation of the good to result would more than balance the punishment he endured; and as God inflicts no punishment now, except the compunctions of conscience, it is as clear as demonstration that the sinner gets all the good resulting from sin, both by anticipation, and actual possession of the result when God shall overrule it for his good, and that too, without any punishment at all; for what man's conscience would trouble him for doing that which he could not help and which he knew to be the eternal and unchangeable purpose of God? As well might his conscience goad him for not being six feet high! Who knows, according to Universalism, but God may find some way to damn men to all eternity and still overrule it for their good?

But my opponent believes that righteous men will not be rewarded for their virtuous deeds only in this life,—the reward is never postponed till a future state. This is another proof that his doctrine holds out more inducements for vice than virtue. A man dies in the act of committing murder and is launched into eternity without having the murder overruled for his good; and hence, as all sin is to be overruled for the good of the sinner it follows that this sin will be overruled for his good in the future state; and thus, whilst virtuous conduct will not benefit us in a future state, wickedness will be an eternal advantage to us by being overruled for our good! If I believed this doctrine, I should consider myself morally bound to commit all the sin I could, that it might be overruled for the good of myself and others! Thus "the goodness of God," in overruling

all sin for good, instead of leading men to repentance, should lead them to continue in sin that grace might abound, and that the goodness of God might overrule it all for their good: or if I repented at all it would be because I had not committed more sin, that I might have more overruled for my good.

It is an absolute contradiction in terms, to say that the goodness of God will lead a man to repent of his sins, and at the same time lead him to commit sin, by assuring him that the very worst thing he could do would result in good, and would inhance his happiness for eternity. Suppose I should ask my friend, why he preaches Universalism: his answer doubtless would be, to make men happier in this life, by doing away with the unnecessary and servile fear of a future hell. But if his doctrine be true, that God will overrule every thing for good, why not let them fear future punishment? The more hell and damnation is preached to them, the more they will fear, and the happier they will be when it comes to be overruled for their good! If I believed the doctrine of my friend, I would preach up endless damnation even if there was some doubt concerning it, for it would in the outcome benefit those who feared it; and I would lose nothing by preaching such falsehoods (if such they be,) for they would be overruled for my good.

But my opponent is verily found fighting against God, in trying to banish the fear of a future hell; for God foreordains whatsoever comes to pass; and it has come to pass, somehow or other, that a very large majority of the world believe in a future hell; and hence God has foreordained or decreed it; and as God would not decree a thing that was not right, even sin itself, according to Universalism, it must be right therefore for the orthodox to believe just as they do! If my friend admits this, which he cannot avoid, then he is doing wrong whenever he opposes them; for it is unquestionably *wrong* to oppose that which is *right*. Will he argue that God could will or decree that men should fear hell and a lake of fire and brimstone which never will exist? If so, then it follows that some men will eternally fear hell as God is without variableness or shadow of turning: and hence those who are now tormented with that fear, which owes its existence alone to the decree of God, will be thus tormented to all eternity; and what will become of my friend's universal happiness and holiness? But the whole matter is getting badly mixed, so I will rest till my friend tries to straighten it out.

## ALPHA'S THIRD SPEECH.

Fellow citizens: My opponent manifested quite an anxiety, at the commencement of his speech, that I should not present too many points, and that he wished to have sufficient time to examine thoroughly every argument adduced. I think he has no ground for complaint, and in his next speech he had better request me to make *no arguments* at all; for he has utterly failed to notice those upon

which I relied in my last address, in support of the doctrine of universal salvation.

It is true, he examined the doctrine that God was the author of sin, and the view that sin would be overruled for good; but did I make that a point in this discussion? By no means. I simply referred to that idea as the only reasonable way to account for the existence of sin, and from the fact that my first argument necessarily leads to the conclusion that sin is according to the will of God: hence the necessity of making him the author of sin in some mysterious sense, that he might overrule it for good! I was aware also of the difficulties and apparent absurdities that might be presented according to this ground; and am not at all indebted to my opponent for the information, as I had thought of the same conclusions years ago. Hence, I have never urged that matter very strongly, neither do I think it would be detrimental to my doctrine if I should throw it up altogether and admit that sin came into existence contrary to the will of God. But here again difficulties would stare us in the face. Let my friend first tell us why God, who is almighty in power, did not prevent the existence of sin, if it be an evil of a *positive* character (that is, one that is unmixed evil or that shall not be overruled for the good of the sinner,) before he undertakes to expose the absurdities of my position. If I cannot reconcile the tendency of my doctrine, in all respects, as to sin being overruled for good, neither can he account for its existence at all, so we stand upon equal footing.

But my arguments, as I observed before, upon which I based my doctrine, have not been met, neither do I think they can be. The audience no doubt recollects them. I will, however, briefly state them again: God is infinite in *power*, *wisdom* and *goodness*. This proposition my friend does not call in question. From this we drew the following conclusions: 1. His infinite goodness would prompt him to desire the endless happiness of the whole human race. 2. His infinite wisdom was sufficient to devise means adequate to the accomplishment of the end desired; and 3. His infinite power is all-sufficient to carry into effect the means devised by infinite wisdom; so that the end prompted by infinite goodness will be attained. The result is Universalism. This no one can successfully meet.

I predicated another argument upon this same foundation, arranged in a different manner. One of three grounds must be admitted: either 1. God *can* save all men, but *will not;* or 2. God *will* save all men, but *cannot;* or 3. God *can* save all men, and *will* save all. If my friend should take the first view, and say that God *can* but *will not*, he limits his *goodness*. If he should prefer the second, and say that God *will*, but *cannot*, he limits his *power:* but if he should choose the third, and say he *can* and *will*, he admits Universalism, the very doctrine for which I am contending. But more still: God is perfectly holy in himself, and it is not at all likely that

he will permit *unholiness* eternally to exist in direct opposition to his nature! And if, as my friend argues, the Almighty has no pleasure in wickedness, will a being of infinite power permit a thing to exist to all eternity which is opposed to his pleasure? Surely such a supposition is not admissible for a moment. Sin must therefore, and will be destroyed, as certain as "the Lord God *omnipotent* reigneth."

But my opponent says I do not believe in the attribute of justice! I say to him, in the language of scripture: "Thou art the man." Universalists are the only men on earth who believe in the justice of God. This I say, fearless of contradiction; and for this reason: All men originally belonged to God, and it would be unjust for him to lose anything that is rightfully his! Would it not be unjust for the devil to drag down to everlasting destruction those who were the legal property of God? The justice of God is infinite, and requires the universal salvation of all men; and it is not in the power of man or the devil to rob God, or to cheat him out of that which is justly his due. But more still: the infinite justice of God requires that his glory should not be diminished; and if some are eternally lost, it will be curtailing that glory which is due to God alone. But as no man has power to add to or diminish from the glory of God, it follows that infinite justice must be satisfied, and the declarative glory of God sustained by universal salvation, and nothing less! I hope the audience will bear this argument in mind, and see in what way my friend will attempt to meet it, if he attempt it at all.

He did not object to my *a priori* logic, and I presume from this he admits it to be correct. I have accordingly reasoned from what God is, to what he must do, and Universalism is the inevitable result. Let these arguments be first replied to and fairly met, and we shall be forthcoming with an abundance more. I expect he will excuse himself for want of time, but he shall have as much time as he desires; and I trust the Moderators will put him in mind of them if he inclines to pass them by!

Before taking my seat, I wish to observe that this discussion is not merely for the sake of victory, or to show who shall get the mastery, as far at least, as I am concerned; but my sincere object is truth. And certain it is, if I am in an error I shall give my friend a fair chance to set me right; and at the same time, I shall endeavor to observe the "golden rule," to do to him as I would like to have him do to me.

## OMEGA'S THIRD REPLY.

Gentlemen: There is to be more interest, I perceive, in the discussion than I had at first anticipated. I am glad to find my friend of such an amiable turn, and to possess such an accommodating spirit. I shall endeavor to reciprocate. But he has, as I predicted, *given* up the theory that God himself is the author of sin, and will

overrule it all for the good of the sinner. He says he had seen its absurdities years ago, and that he did not make it a point in the present discussion. But I leave it to the audience to judge if he did not, when he introduced the argument, refer to the *Pro and Con*, and admit it to be the faith of all Universalists.

But he appears to have one thing to console him, and that is that I am as deeply involved as himself. He tells me to account for the existence of sin on my principles: how it is, that sin could be introduced contrary to the will of that God who is infinite in power. But it is his business to account for it, as much as mine, as it is no more my doctrine than his, since he has yielded up the other notion, and acknowledged himself involved in difficulty; and also that it leads to *absurdities* which he had seen years ago. And as no doctrine can be true that can be logically reduced to absurdities, he must therefore believe with me, that sin was introduced contrary to the will of God, notwithstanding his infinite power. Now let him account for it, as he understands the attributes of God so well as to risk his salvation on a theory which has no other foundation. I said at the commencement, and I say so still, that I do not profess to understand every thing connected with the attributes of the incomprehensible Jehovah. There is one thing, however, unavoidable; if sin came into existence contrary to the will of God, as we see must have been the fact, then no other conclusion can follow except that God could not prevent it. But I know it is urged that all things are possible with God. This however is not true without being qualified; for it is "impossible for God to lie," [Heb. 6. 18.] and "*He cannot deny himself.*" [2 Tim. 2. 13.] Upon the same principle it would be impossible for God to make man a moral agent, and make him an irresponsible machine at the same time; and thus only can we account for the fact, that it was impossible for God to prevent the existence of sin.

My friend appears to intimate as much as that I have conceded his *a priori* logic to be correct. In this he is mistaken. I do admit, however, the true *a priori* reasoning, which is to draw conclusions from established premises, or to trace out effects from known causes. But the system adopted by my friend is not to be found in any logic in Christendom. Who can know the cause or the premises from which he deduces the conclusion of universal salvation? None but God! Well may the question be propounded, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" My opponent answers yes! "Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Yes, says my friend, I can know him like a book: and one would think, from the positive manner in which he speaks of what God's attributes must do, and what they must not do, that Jehovah was no more than a plaything in his hands! But in vain will he attempt to fathom the incomprehensible Deity. Infinity is an ocean without a shore,—a center without a circumference. All is mystery,—creation responds Amen, and echo

answers *mystery!* No more can we comprehend the infinite *I Am*, with finite powers of perception, than we can measure unlimited space with a ten-foot pole. We may tell what the power, wisdom, and goodness of *man* may do; for this is within the limits of our comprehension; but no man can tell what the infinite attributes of God will do, only from what they have done. This is the *a posteriori* reasoning of true philosophy connected with this awfully sublime subject; and as God, in all his judgments inflicted upon the human family, has manifested his infinite wisdom, power and goodness, in separating the righteous from the wicked,—in destroying the rebellious, and saving the godly out of temptation: it is but logical and reasonable to infer that he will continue to do the same. And as he does not now, in the present state of being, cause such separations, and destructions of the ungodly as he did in days of old, it follows that such will be the case in the future state. This must be as certain as God is unchangeable, a proposition which my friend says is the chief corner-stone of the edifice he is endeavoring to erect. But a more suicidal effort could not be made than to erect his edifice upon the immutability of God. Look at the premises and conclusion. God has never justified the wicked, but has in all cases poured out his vengeance and indignation upon their heads for trampling under foot his authority: but God is unchangeable,—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever;—therefore he will fail to do in eternity what he has always done in time! This is the logic of Universalism.

Having thus laid our foundation, we shall attend to the argument. My opponent states his propositions thus: 1. God's infinite goodness would prompt him to desire the salvation of all mankind. 2. His infinite wisdom was sufficient to devise means adequate to its accomplishment; and 3. His infinite power was all-sufficient to carry those means into execution, so that the end prompted by infinite goodness will be attained. This is a correct statement of his first argument, and it shall be fairly examined. But why did not my friend bring into his argument all God's attributes as well as these three? The truth is, there would have been too many strings upon which to play the music of Universalism! Suppose the infinite attribute of *vengeance* had been substituted for goodness, it would have created the harmony of discord with his doctrine. Let us try how that string will vibrate. 1. His infinite *vengeance* (abstract from goodness) would prompt him to desire the damnation of the whole human family. 2. His infinite wisdom was all-sufficient to devise means adequate to bring about the end prompted by infinite vengeance; and 3. His infinite power was sufficient to carry those means into execution, so that the end prompted by infinite vengeance, which is universal damnation, would he attained! This is sound, but not very amiable logic.

But let us look at it from another angle. 1. God's infinite good-

ness would prompt him to desire the holiness and happiness of all men in this life. 2. His infinite wisdom was sufficient to devise means adequate to its accomplishment; and 3. His infinite power was all-sufficient to carry into execution the means devised by infinite wisdom, so that the end prompted by infinite goodness (a present universal salvation from sin and misery,) would be attained. Thus you discover that my opponent's logic contradicts plain matters of fact, and consequently cannot be sound. He is compelled to take one of two grounds: either 1. That God is now in favor of universal holiness and happiness, or 2. He is opposed to it. If he choose the second, then God will always be opposed to universal holiness and happiness, for he is without variableness or shadow of turning! But if he prefer the first, and say God is in favor of present holiness and happiness, then let him give us the reason why all are not now holy and happy. The very reason he will assign why all are not now holy and happy, I will also assign why all will not be holy and happy in the future state. Will he tell us that God's goodness is now deficient? Then he will never be any better unless he is changeable, and consequently those whom his infinite goodness will not now save, will remain unsaved eternally. But will he take the ground that his wisdom is at fault. If so, then those who fail to be saved now, will be lost forever, for God is now as wise as he ever will be. But will he take the ground that the *power* of God is lacking, and that this is the reason why all are not now saved. If so, then it follows that *infinite power* is not strong enough to save some men here; and as nothing stronger than infinite power can be expected in the next life, it is evident that such men cannot be saved there. But, finally, should he take the position that God's wisdom, power, and goodness are as perfect and as much in favor of universal holiness and happiness now as they ever will be, but that the fault is all on the part of man, then it follows that man, as a moral agent, has power to frustrate a plan prompted by infinite goodness, devised by infinite wisdom, and which infinite power was about to carry into execution; and also, that God exercises his attributes with regard to man's salvation only in such manner as will comport with man's moral agency, as a being subject to moral government. This latter is unquestionably the true ground, and of course operates as much against universal salvation at one time as another.

But the same argument, to which we have just replied, was presented in a different form which we will also consider. Thus: One of three grounds must be admitted: either 1. God can save all men, but will not; or 2. God will save all men, but cannot; or 3. God can save all men, and will save all. If you admit the first, and say he *can* but *will* not: you admit his power but limit his goodness. If you admit the second, and say he will but cannot: you admit his goodness but limit his power. But if you choose the third, and say he *will* and *can*, you admit Universalism! Here then is the argument,

and my opponent, no doubt, thinks it unanswerable. Let us test it by applying the *reductio ad absurdum.*

One of three grounds must be admitted : either 1. God can damn all men but will not ; or 2. God will damn all men but cannot ; or 3. God can damn all men, and will damn all ? If my opponent should admit the first, and say that God can but will not, he grants him power but denies his vengeance, which attribute belongs exclusively to God. If he admit the second, and say he will but cannot, he grants him vengeance, but denies his power : but if he admit the third ; and say he *will* and *can*, he will have universal damnation, or his own logic is good for nothing.

But this can also be disposed of by bringing it to bear upon facts as they now exist. Let us try it. One of three grounds must be admitted : either 1. God can save all men from sin in the present life but will not : or 2. He will save all men but cannot : or 3. He can save all men in the present life and will save all. If my friend admit the first, and say he can but will not, he grants the Almighty power but denies his goodness. If he prefer the second, and say he will but cannot, he admits his goodness, but denies his power ; but if he adopt the third, and say he can and will save all in the present life, he will say that which every one knows to be false. Thus his logic breaks down and goes to pieces, and let him gather up the fragments if he can.

After all my friend's philosophy, he finds the stubborn fact of present sin and misery (and that too, as he has to admit, contrary to the will of God,) staring him continually in the face ; and as long as his hypothetical views contradict known matters of fact the whole scheme must be considered sophistical and false. Notwithstanding the fact that before God created the earth his wisdom, power and goodness were just as infinite as they are now or ever will be, yet sin and all its concomitant woes were introduced into the world. This being so, it must either have been according to God's will or against it. If we say against his will then it may continue against his will to all eternity ; for his will can be no stronger at one time than at another. But if we say according to his will and decree, then sin and misery may eternally exist, as God is unchangeable. It will be a difficult task to prove that God, who is without variableness or shadow of turning, will so vary and turn as to decree out of existence that which exists alone by the good pleasure of his counsel.

The angels in heaven might have been cheated by this very system of logic had my opponent been there before the earth was created. Suppose the angel Gabriel to come to him and inform him that the Almighty was about to create a world, and to people it with a race of beings who, he predicted, would sin against God and thereby introduce sorrow, sighing, sickness, and death; and that more than *eighteen hundred millions* of those intelligent beings whom God was about to create in his own image would fall in the field of battle,

—would hew each other to pieces with the sword,—would burn each other at the stake,—would commit each other to dens of ferocious animals to be torn in pieces, and that the earth was to be no better than a slaughter-house,—a valley of carnage and blood-shed for six thousand years! No, no, says my opponent. Gabriel, you are deceived upon this subject, in thinking that the Almighty is a being who would permit such sin and suffering to come into existence. I can demonstrate, he would say to Gabriel, from the attributes and perfections of God that you are a false prophet, and that such a disastrous result can never occur in the universe of created intelligences. One of three grounds you must admit: either 1. God *could* prevent such a state of things from coming into existence, but *will not;* or 2. He would prevent it but cannot; or 3. He *can* and *will* prevent it. If you choose the first ground, Gabriel, and say that God *can* prevent such a state of things but *will not*, you limit his goodness, which all the angels in heaven know to be infinite. If you adopt the second ground, and say that God *would* prevent all that suffering but *cannot*, you admit his goodness but limit his power, which is too absurd to be thought of. But if you prefer the third ground, and say that God *can* prevent such a state of things and *will* prevent it, you not only allow the attributes of God to exist in infinite fullness and perfection, but you give up your cruel dogma of sin and misery and admit that universal love, joy, and peace will be the ruling principle in that beautiful world which the Almighty is about to create. At such profound reasoning, that mighty seraph would doubtless have yielded the point and remained firm in the faith of universal holiness and happiness until facts to the contrary had forced him to a contrary opinion.

But I am not yet done with this phase of the subject, as I intend fully to meet this new *a priori* logic before taking my seat.

The assumption that the nature of God, because he is perfectly holy, will not permit sin and misery to exist in the future state, is as baseless as a castle in the air. Sin and misery are either opposed to the nature of God now or they or not. If they are not, then they never will be, for his nature changes not; and consequently they will always exist. But if sin and misery are now opposed to the nature of God, it proves that they may exist notwithstanding God's nature is opposed to them. And if they can exist six thousand years contrary to the nature of God, they may, on the same principle, exist eternally for aught the nature of God has to do with the matter. But as sin and misery do now exist, and that too, in opposition to the nature of God, it must be for one of two reasons; either 1. God is willing a thing should exist in opposition to his nature, or 2. He cannot prevent it. If the first, then God will always be willing for wickedness to exist in opposition to his nature (for he is unchangeable,) and will consequently be eternally opposed to himself. But if we admit the second, and say that God cannot now prevent the ex-

istence of that which opposes his nature then we have the same stereotyped conclusion that he can never prevent it, for he is as wise and as powerful now as he ever will be.

Because God has no *pleasure* in wickedness, my opponent thinks he will certainly destroy it, and that it cannot possibly exist to all eternity. But the arguments relative to sin as opposed to the nature of God, will apply equally to this case. But if, as my friend thinks, God will absolutely destroy that in which he has no pleasure, then it proves the utter destruction of some men, as well as wickedness, for it is written concerning them: "I have *no pleasure* in you, saith the Lord." What then, according to his own logic, becomes of my opponent's universal salvation?

Again: If God ever intends to destroy sin by absolute force why did he not put a stop to it in the garden of Eden when he would have had much less to do than at present or at any future period? Or if, as my opponent argues, the whole matter relative to the destruction of sin depends upon the *omnipotençe* of God, why did he not act consistently and exert himself in putting a veto upon the power of the devil, and thus prevent the existence of sin altogether? And as God did not prevent the existence of sin by absolute force, it was either because he *could not* or *would not*. If you say because he *would not*, then sin will eternally exist, for my opponent will tell you, as he has already done, that the *will* of the immutable God cannot change. But if you say that God did not prevent the existence of sin from the fact that he *could not*, then it follows that *infinite power* (consistent with the moral agency of man, and the moral government of God) could not prevent its existence, and as nothing stronger than infinite power can be expected in the future state, we can but reasonably infer that sin will exist there as well as here. For if Almighty power was not strong enough to prevent the existence of sin, how can it be proved that the same power will cause it to cease after obtaining the foot-hold it has in his moral universe? Any one can see that it would be much easier to prevent that mighty rock from starting down the hillside than to check it after it gets under head-way! So much for the existence of sin.

But still my friend thinks that the attributes of God are in favor of a future universal salvation. Granted: but no more so then they are in favor of a present universal salvation. This I have before repeatedly shown. If, however, God's infinite goodness wills the present salvation of all men, which it certainly does;—if his infinite wisdom has devised the best possible plan for its accomplishmnt, which it certainly has; and if infinite power has been exerted to its utmost extent to put that plan into execution, which is most unquestionably the case; why then are not all men saved? One of two answers must be given: either God is to blame for the failure, or else the fault is on the part of man. If we say God is to blame, then he will always be to blame, *for my opponent* quotes and insists that he is without variableness

or shadow of turning, and hence, all men will never be saved. But if we say the fault is on the part of man, then this admission proves that God exerts his attributes with reference to man's salvation only in such a manner as will comport with man as a moral responsible agent. And if man, exercising his moral agency, can frustrate the plan of God with regard to his present salvation, even when that plan was brought into operation by infinite goodness, wisdom, and power combined; can he not I ask, on the same principle, and exercising the same moral agency, frustrate the same plan also with regard to his eternal salvation? God either intends to save all men by absolute force, or else their salvation depends upon their own conduct. If the latter, then it is conditional; but if the former, why does he not act consistently and save them all at once and have done with it? As he does not now save men by bare, absolute force, it is either because this is not his way of saving men; or else he is perfectly willing that some men should remain guilty and condemned. If the latter, then they will always remain guilty and condemned, as God is immutable; but if absolute force be not God's way of saving men, then all arguments based upon the omnipotence of God with reference to man's salvation, are of no avail. But finally; if God's attributes are ever to save the wicked whom they fail to save here in time, it cannot be till his attributes get stronger, or till wicked men reform and get better. If they are not saved till God's attributes get *stronger*, then they will remain eternally lost, for my opponent boasts of the proposition that God is unchangeable. To take the ground that the wicked must reform and get better before the attributes of God can effect their salvation, is to renounce Universalism, by admitting the eternal destiny of man to be suspended upon his own conduct! Thus the doctrine is hemmed in until escape from the foregoing dilemmas would seem to be hopeless.

There are some other points I had intended to notice in this speech, but I will wait till I have heard the other side.

## ALPHA'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Fellow-citizens: Your attention has been invited for a considerable length of time to the arguments of my opponent. There has been considerable ingenuity shown, I admit; but I am glad the audience have the power to discriminate between real argument and sophistry. His effort during the whole speech has been, as any one can see, not so much to elicit truth as to assail my *a priori* reasoning. How he has succeeded the audience, of course will judge for themselves, let me say what I will. I have no disposition, neither should I take time if I had, to follow him through all his syllogisms, dilemmas, trilemmas, &c., &c., for this would not only be calling my attention from my regular congeries of arguments which I intend to present in this discussion, but it would also be laying a tax upon the

patience of the audience, which I, by no means would feel jusitfiable in doing, and to which, doubtless, they would not submit.

The principal argument in my last speech, which was predicated upon the justice of God, has not so much as been noticed. I proved as the audience will recollect, that God's justice demands the salvation of all men, and that neither man nor the devil can cheat him out of that which justly belongs to him. I showed, also, that his glory could not be diminished, and that the declarative glory of God demands universal holiness and obedience! Will this demand ever be satisfied? But where is the justice of endless damnation?. It is a solemn farce to urge such a moral government, and the God of orthodoxy is tacitly confessed to be a cruel and vindictive tyrant, rather than a God of justice! My friend may ask me why God permits men to suffer at all? I answer, that they may know how to appreciate happiness! It is only by contrast that we can know when we are happy; and we could not enjoy the pleasure of holiness and purity, had we never committed sin! This accounts, also, for the present existence of sin and suffering.

My opponent's arguments from first to last are predicated upon the assumption, that man is a moral agent; or, in other words, that he is in possession of a free will. This is one of the greatest errors of the present age.—The doctrine of free agency is argued at full length in the *Pro and Con of Universalism*, by brother Rogers, and we are all compelled to come to the same conclusion he did, namely: that the notion of a free will is nothing but a chimera. Hence, whatever we are to do, as involuntary instruments in the hands of God, we will certainly and inevitably do, and the idea of *volition, choosing, refusing*, etc., are all out of the question. Man is only free in appearance, and acts only as he is acted upon, by decree, by motive, or by some other moving cause. Where, then, is the justice or propriety of eternal punishment?

I will here introduce an argument, which, if correct, will shiver my friend's doctrine to atoms. I refer to the true and scriptural design of punishment, which is every where in the Bible, spoken of as for the express benefit of the punished. God chastises for no other purpose than for our good,—in order to reformation. This I shall abundantly prove hereafter; but I have only time here to introduce the matter for further consideration.

I will now offer another argument, and carry it out legitimately, which is of itself sufficient to establish Universalism without the assistance of any other. It is predicated upon the acknowledged truth that "*God is love!*"

My proposition is that *God is infinitely good.* David says: "The Lord is good unto all and his tender mercies are over all his works." [Ps. 145. 9.] Solomon says: "Thou lovest all the things that are, and abhorest nothing which thou hast made; for never wouldst *thou have made any thing* to have hated it." Christ says: "There is

none good but one, that is God." [Mark 10. 18.] John says: "God is love." [1 John 4. 8, 16.] Thus the very essence, the whole nature of God is benevolence, goodness, or love. Dr. A. Clark has well remarked: "God is never said in the Scriptures to be justice, or patience, or holiness; but he is frequently, in one form or other, said to be love." When, therefore, we say, God is infinitely wise, powerful, just, merciful, &c., we do but say: Love is infinitely wise, powerful, just, merciful, &c., these being but the modifications and attributes of infinite love. When we say all are created, controlled, governed and disposed by God, we do but say: Love creates, controls, governs and disposes of all. The goodness or love of God being co-eval and co-extensive with his wisdom, and even with his existence, must attend that being through every period of his existence. If there be in the universe of intelligences a solitary being to whom God is not good, then his benevolence, being limited to less than the whole, is not infinite. But as all allow that his goodness is infinite, no other legitimate conclusion can follow, but that his love extends to every being he has ever created!—When we say God is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, it is but the omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence of infinite love. And as love is omnipresent, we cannot go therefore where infinite love does not exist. No man can go beyond, or get out of the reach of, infinite goodness. All mankind, not excepting saints or sinners,—every intelligent creature throughout the vast and unbounded universe of Jehovah, are forever surrounded, encircled, upheld, above, around, beneath, in life, in death, in time present, and time to come, by Almighty, and infinite goodness, and by all-pervading, omnipresent *love!* Moreover, God being love, he cannnot exist aside from his nature; and if God should cease to love the sinner, that moment he ceases to be God, for God is love! From all this I draw the unavoidable conclusion: universal salvation! Can my friend dispose of this argument? I am perfectly willing that he should try it; and will therefore take my seat, without introducing any other matter to call his attention from this, lest he may have some excuse for passing it by.

## OMEGA'S FOURTH REPLY.

Respected audience: I know not why it is that my worthy friend is almost in every speech insinuating that I will feign some excuse for not grappling with his arguments. I have felt no such disposition, and am perfectly willing the people present should judge for themselves, whether I do or do not come to the task of frankly answering him. Whilst this last argument is fresh in your minds, I will examine into its merits. But, in the first place, I will offset it, by giving another, built upon the same principle of logic.

*God is infinite in vengeance.* Paul says, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." [Rom. 12. 19.] David says, "Kiss the

son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." [Ps. 2. 12.] The apostle says, "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man." [Rom. 2. 9.] "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." [Heb. 10. 31.] And finally says Paul: "Our God is a consuming fire." [Heb. 12. 39.] Thus the very essence, the whole nature of God, is indignation, vengeance, or a consuming fire. God is never said in the scriptures to be justice, or patience, or holiness; but he is frequently, in one form or other, said to be a consuming fire, which is equivalent to vengeance. When therefore we say, God is infinitely wise, jealous, powerful, and just, we do but say that a consuming fire is infinitely wise, jealous, powerful, and just,—these being but modifications and attributes of infinite vengeance. When we say all are creat. d, controlled, governed, and disposed by God, we do but say, that a consuming fire creates, controls, governs, and disposes of all. The indignation or vengeance of God, being co-eval and co-extensive with his wisdom, and even with his existence, must extend to every being he has ever created, and attend that being through every period of his existence. If there be in the universe of intelligences a solitary being to whom God is not angry, then his vengeance, being limited to less than the whole, is not infinite. But as all must allow that his vengeance is infinite, no other legitimate conclusion can follow, but that his vengeance extends to every creature he has ever created! When we say God is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent; it is but the omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence of an infinite consuming fire! And as God is a consuming fire, and at the same time omnipresent, we cannot go, therefore, where infinite vengeance does not exist. No man can go beyond, or get out of the reach of infinite wrath! All mankind, not excepting saints or sinners,—every intelligent creature throughout the vast and unbounded dominions of Jehovah, are forever surrounded, encircled, upheld, above, around, beneath, in life, in death, in time present, and time to come, by Almighty and infinite vengeance; and by an all pervading and omnipresent consuming fire. Moreover, God being a consuming fire, he cannot exist aside from his nature; and if he should ever cease to burn the sinner, that moment he ceases to be God, for God is a consuming fire! From all this I draw the logical and unavoidable conclusion,—*universal damnation!*

I might leave my friend's grand proposition here, as being satisfactorily met and set aside; but I have a few remarks to make upon this declaration—"God is love." The truth is, neither *love* nor *consuming fire* is the nature of God; but they are each his character toward men under different circumstances. *Truth* and *holiness* form the very essence and nature of God. Hence, the Spirit of God, is called the "Spirit of *holiness*," [Rom. 1. 4.] and the "Spirit of *truth*," [John 15. 26,] but it is never called the Spirit of *love* or Spirit of *vengeance.* But let us inquire if the fact that God is *love*, will prove

universal salvation, admitting *love* to be his nature. Not exactly; for the text speaks of him in the present tense: "God *is* love," not, *will be* love at the resurrection; but he *is* as much *love* now as he ever will be, and he is just as *omnipresent* now, as he ever will be, and just as *infinite* now as he ever will be; and yet, notwithstanding all this, sinners can live in the midst of this *infinite*, and *omnipresent* love, guilty, miserable, and condemned; and finally die in their sins, and go into eternity in the midst of corruption, dissipation, and depravity, and all the time too, enveloped and encircled in the embraces of infinite love! The proposition that God is love does not appear to help the cause of my opponent, any more than if God was essentially hatred; for if men can be guilty, miserable and *damned*, three score and ten years, as Universalism teaches, and all the time surrounded with omnipresent and infinite love, they may, on the same principle, be *damned* to all eternity, notwithstanding this infinite love; and more than that, they actually will be, as certain as God is *immutable!* God is not, however, omnipresent, in the sense in which he is love, any more than omnipresent in the sense in which he is a consuming fire.

I remarked a minute ago, that these terms represent the character of God toward men in different attitudes, or relations, and under different circumstances. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." [2 Cor. 5. 19,] and in this sense only are we to understand the proposition, "God is love." Those who are in Christ, are in love; for the apostle informs us that the love of God "is *in* Christ Jesus our Lord." [Rom. 8. 39.] If the love of God was omnipresent, or if God was omnipresent in the sense in which he is love, then there would be no such thing possible as getting out of the love of God: and this being true, there would be no meaning in the apostle's injunction: "Keep yourselves in the love of God." [Ju. 21,] for let a man do the very worst he could, he would still be in the love of God, and could not possibly get out of it! But those who were out of Christ, the apostle says, are without hope and "*without God in the world*," [Eph. 2. 12.] that is, they are without God, in the sense in which he is love! But in the verse preceding this proof-text, the apostle shows that God is not omnipresent in the sense in which he is here speaking, any more than he is omnipresent as a consuming fire; for he says: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and *he in God;*" [Verse 15,] and if God was omnipresent in this sense, a man would dwell in God whether he confessed that Jesus was the Christ or not! And in the very verse where this proof-text occurs, the apostle pointedly teaches that God is not omnipresent in the sense in which he is love. "God is love, and he that dwelleth in *love*, dwelleth in God." [Verse 16.] Do all men dwell in love? How about those that are "*haters of God!*" [Rom. 1. 30.] Do they dwell in love? If not, then they do not dwell in God, and hence God, in this sense, is not omnipresent; and

all the argument of my opponent upon this text is not worth a rush.

I shall now attend to my friend's argument, based upon the justice of God. He was mistaken when he said that I charged him with denying the attribute of justice. I did say, however, that he had no faith in the attribute of vengeance; and his arguments so far, have proved the assertion to be correct; for he has not as yet noticed it, although I have repeatedly made it a point in this discussion.

He thinks that the justice of God requires universal salvation. I grant it. But, says he, God cannot be cheated, or wronged out of any thing that is justly his due. I deny it. The service of all men in this life justly and rightfully belongs to God; yet hundreds and thousands serve the devil with all their hearts as long as they live! Now one of two things my opponent is compelled to admit: Either that God is unjustly wronged or cheated out of the service of those who serve the devil; or, that the devil has a right to it! If he says that God is wronged out of their service in this world, then he may be wronged out of their service in the next world also, and to all eternity, for God will be no more able to maintain his rights in that world than in this. But if he prefer the ground that the devil has a just right to their services in this world, he may on the same principle hold his claim in the next. Truth is, the justice of God as much demands the salvation of all men here, as hereafter; and if man or the devil can violate those claims here, they can also be violated in the world to come!

But he still argues that the ultimate glory of God requires universal salvation, and that his glory cannot be frustrated or diminished. But here again he errs, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. Is not the salvation of all men as necessary and desirable at one time as another? If so, would it not just as much enhance the declarative glory of God for all men to be saved in time as in eternity? Most assuredly; yet all men are not saved, and consequently God's glory is *minus* so much. My friend appears to be entirely unaware of the fact that men can add to or diminish from the glory of God by their conduct here in time. Let us enlighten him. Paul, in describing the character of the world before the first advent of Christ, says, that "all had sinned and *come short* of the glory of God." [Rom. 3. 23.] In another place he enjoins: "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." [1 Cor. 10. 31.] Thus we may come short of the glory of God by serving the devil, and in this way diminish his glory; or we may add to or enhance his glory by acknowledging his authority in all our words and actions. Now if man has it in his power to diminish the glory of God, to the amount of the worth of his own salvation, and services for the term of three score and ten years, may he not also diminish this glory to the same amount forever?

But where is the justice, my opponent asks, in endless damnation? Before he asks this question, let him compute by figures and tell the enormity of one sin committed against an infinite God, and the exact amount of *heinousness* attached to a whole life time, spent in rebellion against Jehovah; and then let him make an esitmate, and report to this audience the exact amount of punishment necessary to satisfy the demands of infinite justice! Let this all be done, before he talks of injustice and cruelty on the part of God.

But he argues that man is not a moral, responsible agent, and that consequently he is not morally to blame for his conduct. Yet he contends that God has punished and does punish men severely for their sins. Where, permit me to ask, is the justice of this? Can my opponent vindicate the character of God in such a course. First make man a mere machine,—to act only as he is acted upon:—second, decree that he should commit sin, which he is, of course, compelled to commit, and which he is no more to blame for than for being created, and in the third place, lay the blame all on this innocent, and unoffending man; the victim of vindictive cruelty, and beat him with many stripes, for nothing under the heavens but for doing that which he could not possibly have avoided? 'Talking of a God of cruelty—a vindictive Tyrant—comes with an exceeding poor grace from one who believes with my friend? But he may endeavor to save appearances by the plea that God will not, according to his doctrine, inflict eternal punishment. But it is a principle well established, not only in the ordinary affairs of life, but also in the Bible, that he who will be unjust in little, will also be unjust in much! And as the God of Universalism punishes innocent man, a mere irresponsible machine, and that too unjustly, he may of course; on the same principle, punish men unjustly, and with endless damnation, which is only an extension of the same cruel, and unjust principle!

None, therefore, according to my opponent's doctrine, are safe under the reign of such an unjust sovereign as he calls God!

But my friend urges that it is necessary for men to be sinful and miserable in order that they may appreciate holiness and happiness? This doctrine of contrast will get him into a difficulty, I fear, of which he was not at all aware. In the first place, it holds out the strongest conceivable motives to prompt men to commit sin. The more a man sins, the greater will be the contrast, and of course, the more happiness he will enjoy when he becomes holy; and he shall certainly be made holy according to Universalism, let him do the worst he can. But, says my friend, the more he will be punished too! So much the better; for the greater will be the contrast, and he will consequently be the happier, when the punishment ceases. The profligate drunkard would delight to lay up treasures in heaven in this way, and would swallow down my iriend's doctrine with as much pleasure as he does the intoxicating beverage. Yes, the drunker he can get, the sweeter will be his holiness and happiness

when he wakes up sober in heaven! And if he should happen to get punished, by having his heel bruised, or his head broken in some of his drunken sprees, he has all assurance from the doctrine of my opponent that it will work out for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory! That dissipated wretch, under the conviction that this doctrine is true, and with the glorious anticipation which it inspires, could bear with the patience of Job, all his bangs and bruises, with the absolute certainty of being so much the happier when it was all over with! My opponent told us a while ago, that the reason why he preached Universalism, was to do away with the tormenting fear of hell! But why does he not act consistently and let men be tormented with the fear of hell as much as possible, that the contrast may be so much greater, and their bliss so much sweeter when they come to find out their mistake?

But there is another difficulty attending this doctrine of contrast, and that is this. Such abominable characters, after being in heaven a few thousand years, will forget how they felt when they were drunk; and will need what some call a memory-refresher, in order to keep up this happiness of contrast! As the *Pro and Con* testifies it will be like fire that will go out unless occasionally renewed by fresh supplies of fuel! Hence the necessity of having a distillery in heaven that the glory and blessedness of contrast may eternally be enjoyed!

But it is impossible, says my opponent, for any one to appreciate the bliss of holiness and purity who never committed sin. Then the holy angels of God are undoubtedly the most unhappy beings in the universe, for they, according to orthodoxy as well as Universalism, have never sinned, and I doubt very much whether they are accustomed to being sick: so that they are entirely destitute of this exquisite happiness of contrast! The whole creation of infants will be utterly destitute of the sweets of purity and innocence, as they too have never practised iniquity! And finally, if my opponent's doctrine be true, it is the duty of every true philanthropist to start the most successful schemes of wickedness, and to encourage the most diabolical practises both by precept and example, because the more men sin and suffer here, the more extatic will be their bliss when it comes to be overruled for their good, and they shall enter into the full fruition of the blessedness of contrast!

A word further in reference to this question of man's free moral agency. My friend admitted a while ago, that sin was not according to the will of God; and that the doctrine of God's decreeing sin that he might overrule it for the good of the sinner necessarily led to absurdities which he had seen years ago! But now he gets back into the old *absurd* rut that man is nothing but a machine, and can do nothing except what he is compelled to do by virtue of the immutable *decree of Jehovah.* I wonder how many times more he will get

out and into these absurdities before this discussion comes to a close. In denying a *free will* or *moral agency*, he denies the whole revelation of God; for I assert, fearless of contradiction, that there is not a chapter in she Bible that does not hold man as a voluntary, responsible being,—praise-worthy or blame-worthy as his conduct is good or bad! If the doctrine of free will or moral agency be not correct, then no moral responsibility can be required of man, and the idea of blame and praise is out of the question altogether. But if volition, freedom of action, choice, blame, or praise, is to be found taught in the Bible, then the doctrine of my opponent is but the quintescence of infidelity. Look at the following: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore *choose* life, that both thou and thy seed may live." [Deu. 30. 19.] "And Moses said unto Aaron, *choose* us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek." [Ex. 17. 9.] "Go and say unto David, thus saith the Lord, I offer thee three things: *choose* thee *one of them*, that I may do it unto thee." ] 2 Sam. 25. 12.] "Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me, for that they hated knowledge, and did not *choose* the fear of the Lord." [Prov. 1: 28, 29.] "Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called ye did not answer: when I spake ye did not hear, but did evil before mine eyes, and did *choose* that wherein I delighted not." [Is. 65. 12.] "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, *refused* to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter: *choosing* rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." [Heb. 11. 24, 25.] So much for *choosing* and *refusing*, which is but a fraction of the testimony upon that subject. Again: "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be *blamed*." [Gal. 2 11.] "Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be *blameless* in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. [1 Cor. 1. 8.] "Do all things without murmurings and disputings, that ye may be *blameless* and *harmless*." [Phil. 2. 15.] "Now I *praise* you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I deliver them to you." [1 Cor. 11. 2.] "What shall I say?—Shall I *praise* you in this? I *praise you not*." [Ib. 22.] Paul asks: "Am I not *free*?" [1 Cor. 9. 1.] My opponent answers. No; you are a machine; you can move only as you are acted upon; and you have just about as much volition as a water-wheel. Christ says: "*Freely* ye have received, *freely* give." [Math 10. 8.] My friend says: ye can do nothing freely; for ye are all involuntary agents or creatures of circumstances. Once more: "I make a decree, that all they of the people of Israel, and of the priests and Levites, in my realm, which are *minded* of their own *free will* to go up to Jerusalem, go up with thee." [Ezra 7. 13.] My opponent, as well as the *Pro and Con.*, replies: Free will? What nonsense! God has made a decree, that no

man shall have a *free will* any more than a clock to run after it is wound up; and that the notion of a *free will* is a "chimera!"

From the forgoing testimonies we discover that man possesses volition,—the power of *choosing* or *refusing:* that he is responsible for his actions,—that he is *blamed* when he does wrong and *praised* when he does right, and that he possesses a *free will;* none of which can be the case if the doctrine my opponent is endeavoring to inculcate be true. Every phrase made use of in Scripture to express the freedom of the Almighty himself in choosing and refusing, is also applied to man; and thus God himself is proved to be a creature of fate by the very logic which my opponent applies to man! Not only so, but God in the act of creation has stamped a *lie* upon the conscience of every man in the universe. There is no man in any nation but has a consciousness of certain actions being right and others being wrong: and that he could have done differently had he chosen, and who would not acknowledge himself to blame for doing wrong.

This all goes to stamp infidelity upon the doctrine of my opponent. But the genuineness of a doctrine may always be known by its inevitable and necessary tendency. And if my opponent will but look at the natural tendency of his doctrine for a few minutes he will fling it to the moles and bats. Suppose he should go to the legislature of this State, and succeed in convincing that body of the truth of his doctrine,—that man was not a moral responsible agent, and that he was not in the least accountable for his conduct, from the fact that he was merely a machine, acting only as he is acted upon; and hence that it was cruel to enact laws to inflict punishment of any kind upon wicked men, since they are not to blame for their actions. The legislature of course, under the influence of such philosophical logic, breaks open the penitentiary and annuls all laws relative to crime, and enacts a single statute that no man shall be punished for any offense he may hereafter commit. Suppose, in the next place, my opponent should call a general convention of all the cut-throats, horse-thieves, black-legs, murderers, robbers, gamblers, drunkards, liars, profane swearers, debauchees, and villains in the State, and congregate them upon some vast theatre; and then let him commence lecturing them upon his most salutary doctrine of no responsibility, and prove to their conviction that they were not to blame for anything they might do,—let them murder, cheat, steal, lie, or do what they would, they had no choice in the matter,—were only doing that which God had decreed, and which they were no more to blame for than for having an existence! And not only so, but that no human punishment should be inflicted upon them, since all laws upon the subject had been annulled; and as for divine punishment, there was not the least danger since their sins should all be overruled for their good, and they would only be the happier in heaven when they should come to experience the wonderful contrast that *would exist.* Then fancy, fellow-citizens, a thousand hungry wolves

let loose among a flock of as many sheep, and if your imaginations are sufficiently acute, you have an imperfect miniature representation of the wretchedness and devastation which would follow at the breaking up of my opponent's convention! Such is unquestionably the natural and legitimate tendency, and such would be the inevitable and ruinous result of this dogma of fatality could it obtain license to the extent supposed. Having now noticed the principal arguments in my opponent's last speech, I shall again hear what he can add in response.

## ALPHA'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Fellow citizens: It will of course be expected that I should say something in reply to the speech to which you have been listening, before proceeding with my regular congeries of propositions. My opponent has been endeavoring, during the greater part of his address, to fasten the charge of infidelity upon the doctrine of Universalism,—the cause for which I am contending. The audience will just look at the charge, whilst I, in one word expose its fallacy. My opponent, as you are aware, believes that Christ will only save a part of mankind, whilst I believe in Christ twice as much as he does!—This is certainly a new plan of testing infidelity! The man who believes in Christ the most is the greatest infidel! My friend looks upon Christ as a part of a Saviour: yet he is the believer, and I am the infidel! I see several gentlemen in the audience, some of them Calvinists, and some Armenians; and they appear to be exceedingly interested in my opponent's arguments.—Gentlemen, by your permission, I will put two of you together, and make a first-class Universalist! The Calvinist believes that Christ will save all for whom he died; and the Armenian believes that he died for all!—Hence, all will be saved! Now I will leave it to the audience to judge, whether I am an infidel, when I believe in Christ as much as both those gentlemen put together? [A laugh!]

But my opponent endeavors to justify the dogma of endless damnation; and a miserable defence he has made. He tells me to calculate the exact amount of punishment due for sins committed against God. I will inform my friend that man is a finite being, and that all his actions are like himself,—finite in their character. No man can commit an infinite offense, hence the injustice of inflicting infinite punishment. Punishment should always be proportioned to the sin for which it is inflicted; and as sin is finite, punishment must be also; actions in time can in no case extend in their effects into eternity! This is my doctrine exactly;—sin belongs to this life, and does not extend into the future state at all.—Hence, punishment belongs to this life, and will in no case extend into eternity. Whenever a man's body dies, then the very fountain and foundation of sin is destroyed. Sin originates in the flesh, belongs to the flesh, and is not in the least attached to the soul or spirit. This being incontro-

vertibly true, it follows that whenever the flesh dies the individual is free from sin. The apostle testifies the same thing. "He that is dead is freed from sin." [Rom. 6. 7.] Hence, whenever a man leaves this fleshy, sinful state, he has nothing to do but to step out of his sinful body into the elysian fields of the paradise of God! How transcendently sublime is the faith of universal salvation!

But how mighty the contrast between this and the soul-benumbing dogma of endless perdition! Many, in the belief of this doctrine, have become religious maniacs, and have gone into the spirit world by the act of committing suicide. What a horrible death for a rational being to die. And look, also, at the cruel persecutions that have been prosecuted by the believers in that wretched doctrine. Look at the hundreds and thousands who have fallen victims to death, under the withering influence of the doctrine of endless damnation. My heart is chilled when I think of the myriads who have been hurried into eternity by the doctrine of partialism. None have ever been guilty of such barbarous conduct except such as were believers in that heart-withering sentiment!

But my opponent is strong in the faith that those who die in their sins are lost forever! But this must lead him into a difficulty from which he cannot possibly escape. There is no man perfectly free from sin in this life. The greatest saints die in their sins to some extent; and consequently the whole race of Adam will be eternally lost! The only perfect freedom from sin is in the ordeal of death, when the mortal flesh,—this "body of sin is put off."

But I will now carry out the argument on the design of punishment introduced in my last speech. Or, at least, I will give my positive testimony upon that point, and then call upon my opponent to refute it if he can. God says to the children of Israel: "Thou shalt consider in thy heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." [Deu. 8. 5.] Thus the chastisement of the Lord is compared to the chastisement of man; and what father, possessing the feelings that should rule in the breast of every parent, would punish his son with ceaseless perdition? But this is not all the testimony direct upon this point. The Apostle Paul has placed this position beyond the reach of controversy. "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons, for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he *for our profit* that we might be *partakers of his holiness!* Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous; *nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteous-*

*ness.*" [Heb. 12. 5–11.] This is as positive as testimony can make it, that God punishes only with regard to reformation, that the subjects of his chastisement might be partakers of his *holiness;* and he here emphatically test.fies that it is *for our profit*, and that it will yield the *peaceable fruits of righteousness!* This is the true and scriptural design of all punishment. This chastisement is not only inflicted in order to reform the sinner, but God in his benevolence places punishment before men as a motive to deter them from the commission of crime. I could present several other considerations in confirmation of this position; but I will reserve them until I hear how my friend will endeavor to evade those already adduced. As I said before I wish him to have full opportunity to grapple with my testimony and dispose of it if he can; and if he cannot, I hope he will show the candor and fairness to confess it.

## OMEGA'S FIFTH REPLY.

Fellow-citizens: Were it not that my opponent would make capital of it, I would honestly confess that I know not how to dispose of his last speech; not because the arguments which it contains are unanswerable, but because it is the most perfectly heterogeneous mass of self-contradictions that I have ever heard in so short an address. If I can succeed in disentangling its innumerable perversions in thrice the time, I shall have done more than I now expect. We will try, however, to be as brief and as systematic as possible.

In the first part of his speech he endeavored to escape from the charge of infidelity, and I did not at all wonder that the audience should be amused at the funny turn he took. He says he believes in Christ twice as much as I do, because he believes that he will save all, while I believe he will only save a part! Hence, he concludes that I am more of an infidel than he is! Very smart indeed! But stop a little: it is just as much infidelity to believe that Christ will do what he says he will not do as to disbelieve every thing he says. But my opponent did not think of this. He believes that Christ *will* do what he has repeatedly said he *will not do*, which is practical unbelief. I might argue on the same principle, that I was still more of a believer than he, and contend that Christ would take all men to heaven in their sins. He would object to this, and charge me with infidelity for believing a thing which is so manifestly contradicted by reason, common sense, and the Bible. But why, my dear sir, do you charge me with infidelity, when I believe in Christ so much more than you do? Neither does it follow, because I do not believe that Christ will save all, that I hold him only as a *part* of a Saviour. Suppose a physician, with medicine sufficient to cure every case of sickness that might occur, should locate in this town; and suppose a half dozen men, out of sheer negligence or want of confidence, should refuse to take his medicine and consequently die, could it

with any propriety be said that the physician was only *part* of a doctor?

But my friend proved his position by putting a Calvinist and Armenian together. One believes that Christ will save all that he died for; and the other believes that Christ died for all, and hence all will be saved. Well: Armenianism teaches that one sin deserves endless damnation, unless this punishment be shielded off by forgiveness. Universalism teaches that forgiveness in no case shields off deserved punishment: hence, as all have sinned, if you put an Armenian and Universalist together you prove universal damnation! Again: a Calvinist believes that those who die in their sins will be eternally lost. My opponent affirmed in his last speech that there were none, not even the greatest saints, who did not die in their sins. Hence, put my friend and a Calvinist together, and you again have universal damnation! So much for that argument.

But as we are now upon this point, let us inquire into this matter of the greatest saints dying sinners. He first states such to be the fact, and in the next sentence contradicts himself by saying that the moment the body dies sin is put off, and the individual is perfectly freed from it. Thus, instead of dying in his *sins*, death is nothing but a leap *out of sin* and all its contaminations into the presence of God! But this idea, that no man can be perfectly free from sin till death is most absurd. Cannot a man die forgiven? Certainly: if he attend to the means which God has appointed before death. When God forgives a man's sins, is the man yet a sinner? This is truly a singular idea, that God cannot forgive a man's sins, but that there will be some sin left unforgiven! Let us hear how Paul agrees with this doctrine. "And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him having forgiven you *all trespasses*." [Col. 2. 13.] Suppose God should forgive a man *all trespasses* (which he certainly would if he forgave any,) and the man should then die, what would become of my opponent's theory? Universalists will not contend but that Christ was perfectly pure and died without sin. Now what says John? "When he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is: and every man that hath this hope in him, *purifieth himself even as he is pure!*" [1 John 3. 3.] But how is this to be done? The apostle answers: "*If we confess our sins* he is faithful and just to *forgive us our sins*, and to *cleanse us from all unrighteousness*." [Ib. 1. 9.] Thus, if a man should confess his sins in all sincerity before death, God would forgive "*all trespasses*,"—cleanse him from "*all unrighteousness*," and he would die uncontaminated, —"*pure, even as Christ is pure.*" Such are the characters referred to by the Revelator: "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me write: *Blessed* are the dead that *die in the Lord*;" [Rev. 14. 13.] *that is, according to my* friend's logic; Blessed are the dead that *die*

*in their sins,* for all men die in their sins whether they die in the Lord or out of him! The apostle, in speaking of those ancient worthies who walked with God, says "These all *died in faith;*" [Heb. 11. 13,] that is, they all died in their sins according to my friend's logic! What an interesting commentary my opponent could write on the New Testament if he should once set himself about it! Christ says: "If ye believe not that I am he ye shall die in your sins." [John 8. 24.] My biblical friend says: ye shall die in your sins any how, whether you believe on Christ or not, for the greatest saints die sinners! Solomon says: "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord." [Prov. 17. 15] And I would say to my opponent: "thou art the man!" He condemns the just by saying, that the most just man that ever lived died in his sins; and he justifies the wicked by teaching as you have heard, that his sins were all according to the will of God,—that he was an involuntary agent, and consequently not to blame for any thing he did, and that sin should be no injury to him in the out come, as it should be overruled for his good! Thus, according to Solomon, my opponent is an abomination to the Lord, because he both justifies the wicked and condemns the just.

But another argument is presented:—Sin belongs wholly to the body or to the flesh, and is not at all attached to the soul or spirit; and hence, when the body dies, or the flesh returns to the dust, sin ceases as a matter of course! Let us first examine the premises, that sin has nothing to do with the spirit, or that the spirit in the worst sinner remains uncontaminated. "Having these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all *filthiness* of the *flesh and spirit.*" [2 Cor. 7. 1.] It appears from this, that the *spirit* gets contaminated by sin, as well as the flesh. "Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, the spirit that dwelleth in us *lusteth to envy?*" [Jam. 4. 5.] If the *spirit* in a man *lusteth to envy* it is sinful; "For where *envying* and strife is there is confusion and *every evil work.*" [Ib. 3. 16.] But if this should be denied, and it be contended that the lusts of the flesh are the only things that are sinful and that they cannot affect the soul: we answer in the language of Peter: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims abstain from *fleshly lusts* which *war against the soul.*" [1 Pet. 2. 11.] Paul offers up a singular petition, my opponent's doctrine being true: "I pray God your whole *spirit,* and *soul,* and *body,* be preserved *blameless* unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." [1 Thess. 5. 23.] If there can be no blame attached to the *soul* and *spirit,* then the major part of the apostle's prayer was nonsense! If the *spirit* cannot be unholy, why does Paul make this remark? "The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she be *holy* both in *body* and in *spirit.*" [1 Cor. 7. 34.] Solomon does not agree with my opponent, for he came to the conclusion that "the soul of the wicked desireth

*evil.*" [Prov. 21. 10.] Neither does Ezekiel: "Behold all *souls* are mine, as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the *soul* that *sinneth it shall die.*" [Ezek. 18. 4.] Neither does the prophet Micah: "Shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the *sin* of my *soul?*" [Mic. 6. 7.] Such are a few of the many testimonies sustaining the position that sin is connected with, and has its seat in the soul. Truth is, an action that does not originate in the soul, or that is not first resolved in the heart before being carried out into practice is not recognized by the laws of God or man as either *good* or *evil.* The more the spirit or soul has to do with an evil act, in premeditating, planning, resolving, etc., the more heinousness is attached to the crime. But it is most unaccountably strange, that God should inflict all punishment for sin, according to my opponent's creed, upon the spiritual part of man, the *soul,* or the *conscience,* when nothing was engaged in the practice of it except the body! Why not punish the part that is guilty? This, however, is not the only absurdity connected with this theory. My opponent believes that Christ came to save all men from sin. But he cannot save the sculs or the spirits of men from sin, for they are perfectly uncontaminated and pure from its defilements! He cannot save the body from sin; for my opponent believes that the body returns to dust no more to rise. Hence, Christ is neither to save the soul nor the body from sin; and as there is nothing else to be saved, it follows that my opponent does not believe that Christ will save men from sin in any sense! But if the separation of the spirit from i's polluted habitation can be understood as a salvation from sin, then the surest way to save men from sin would be to kill them and separate their souls from their bodies; for my friend teaches that no man can be freed or saved from sin until death! Hence, as Christ did not kill any body, but let them die as they always had done,—a natural death,—he did not therefore come to save any one from sin, and consequently came for nothing at all!

As no man can be freed from sin, until death separates his soul from his body; it would seem to be our duty to kill as many men as possible: for we ought to be instruments in the hand of God of turning many to righteousness, and of converting our fellow creatures from sin to holiness! If I believed the doctrine of my opponent I should arm myself with a brace of revolvers and shoot every man I could find, and I would not be ashamed of this gospel of *powder* and *lead,* for it would prove the power of God unto salvation to every one that I could bring under its influence. Those persecutors of which he spoke so pathetically in his last speech, were the greatest benefactors of mankind that ever lived, though it chilled his heart to think how many myriads of men and woman they had put to death and hurried into eternity. He should rather rejoice to think they had succeeded in making so many sinners holy and happy by *thus sending them* to heaven! What a pity the apostles had not

understood this modern Universalian method of converting sinners! Paul succeeded admirably in this improved gospel plan of salvation before his conversion; but it is not recorded that he ever made a man holy, or turned one sinner to God in this fashion after he became an apostle, although the very object for which Christ appeared to him was to turn men from sin to holiness! The true philanthropist, under the influence of this doctrine, whenever he saw a man in trouble or his family in distressed circumstances, would kill them and send them to heaven! This would be perfectly safe on his part, although it would be murder, as it would be overruled for his good, and it would be conferring on them the most unspeakable blessing!

More than this; all the wicked in former times, whom God swept away with the besom of destruction, instead of being punished, were honored with the most distinguished and exalted favors. God threatened the wicked antediluvians with a dreadful calamity, but he deceived himself, and them likewise; for instead of punishing them as they expected, he sent a flood upon them, and took them all through the door of death into the enjoyment of unspeakable felicity! But Noah, instead of sharing the same blessed privilege, was compelled to wander up and down this unfriendly world three hundred and fifty years, subject to pain and infirmity and finally to pass through the ordeal of death as much as any body else, and only get to heaven at last! Thus the wicked had a decided advantage over Noah and would hold it to all eternity, for there would never be a period when the wicked would not be *three hundred and fifty years* in advance of Noah in point of celestial enjoyment!

When the Lord thought to punish the wicked Sodomites, he deceived them; for they found themselves, after one pang transported into the paradisical presence of God. But righteous Lot, for his unfeigned obedience to the laws of God was debarred from the privilege of sitting down in the kingdom of glory, being compelled to remain for many years in this world of sorrow, vexation and disappointment, whilst those filthy and detestable fellows, who had vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds, were in full possession of heavenly blessedness. Such was also the case with the hosts of Pharoah in the Red Sea; the Canaanites whom Joshua slew with a sword, and such was the case with the wicked Jews, when the Roman army was sent upon them for rejecting the Saviour, and drove them all out of this suffering, miserable, and sinful world, into the presence of God, where there is fullness of joy, and at his right hand, where there are pleasures forever more! Whilst the humble followers of Christ, instead of having been taken to heaven as the wicked Jews were, had to wander in sheep-skins and goat-skins, in dens and caves of the earth,—being destitute, afflicted, and tormented; experiencing trials of cruel mockings and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments; they were

stoned, they were sawn asunder, and were tortured with the most lingering and excruciating deaths that the ingenuity of men and devils could invent; whilst those wicked Jews, who were killed by the Romans, to use the language of my opponent, were regaling their happy spirits in traversing the elysian fields of the paradise of God! To quote the somewhat expressive though not very elegant stanzas:—

"Thus Pharaoh and his mighty hosts
Had God-like honors given:
A pleasant breeze brought them with ease
And took them safe to heaven!

So all the filthy Sodomites,
When God bade Lot retire,
Went in a trice to paradise,
On rapid wings of fire!

Likewise the guilty Canaanites,
To Joshua's sword were given:
The sun stood still that he might kill
And pack them off to heaven!

God saw those villains were too bad
To own that fruitful land;
He therefore took the rascals up
To dwell at his right hand!

The men who lived before the flood
Were made to feel the rod;
They miss'd the ark, but, like a lark,
Were wash'd right up to God!

But Noah he, because you see,
Much grace to him was given;
Was forced to toil, and till the soil,
And work his way to heaven!

The wicked Jews, who did refuse,
The Lord's commands to do:
Were hurried straight to heaven's gate,
By Titus and his crew!

How happy is the sinner's state,
When he from earth is driven;
He knows it is his certain fate
To go direct to heaven!

There's Judas too, another Jew,
Whom some suppose accurs'd;
Yet with a chord he beat his Lord,
And got to heaven first!"

My friend seems to look with horror upon the idea of a man committing suicide. But if his doctrine be true, it is the most sensible act he can commit. He speaks of men who have become religious maniacs from the fear of endless perdition, and have ended their existence in this wretched manner! But no man will become a religious maniac or be led to commit suicide if properly instructed in the religion of Christ, for he is then told just what he has to do in order to secure eternal life, and that there is no necessity for his going to hell even if it be endless. No man under such teaching will ever become deranged so as to put the poisonous cup to his mouth. But teaching men, as my opponent does, that they are creatures of fate,—that they can do nothing only as some superior power moves them leads to this very result; for they, believing such to be the fact, look into the Bible and see that they must do something or be eternally lost, drives to dispair and leads to suicide. It is this false dogma of fatality, amalgamated with the scriptural and restraining doctrine of eternal punishment which leads to these results.

But suppose men, under the influence of insanity, and believing in endless perdition, should commit suicide; my friend should not let it benumb his soul or chill his heart. Why should it horrify him that a man should slip out of this wicked and troublesome world into the inconceivable enjoyment of heaven? Should a man commit suicide, believing as does my friend, so far from being deranged I should consider that his most rational and consistent act, in which he would obey the injunction of the apostle, perhaps for the first time: "Think soberly, as you ought to think."

My friend's doctrine being true, that no man can be free from sin in this life, and that death is the ordeal of freedom, he is morally and scripturally bound to commit suicide, and it can be demonstrated beyond all controversy. He is morally bound, from the fact, that a desire for happiness is the first law of our nature; and my opponent believes that sin and misery are always inseparably connected. Hence it is a man's duty, out of love to himself, to put an end to his existence here, in order to be free from sin and its consequent misery, and to come into the enjoyment of perfect bliss! He is scripturally bound to commit suicide; for it is positively enjoined: "Be ye holy, for I am holy." [1 Pet. 1. 16.] Not only so, but we are commanded to "*perfect* holiness in the fear of the Lord." [2 Cor. 7. 1.] Now, since no man can become holy only by leaving this body of sin at death it follows that suicide is here made a *personal* duty. How does my friend like the legitimate fruits of his theology?

But for additional proof in favor of suicide let us quote a few passages and apply them as does my friend, and note the result. Listen to the invitations of the Saviour: "*Come unto me* all ye that labor and are heavy laden *and I will give you rest*;" and how can this be done but by voluntarily leaving this sinful world and going to heaven "*where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.*" The Father also

invites: "*Come out from among them* and be ye separate, *and touch not the unclean thing*," and again· "*Come out of her O my people* that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." And as this earth, with all it contains is unclean and sinful; and as all men are the people of God, the injunction to come out of her, is unquestionably to leave this sinful world by suicide and "*Lay hold on the hope set before you.*" And whenever you form the resolution to "*choose that good part that shall not be taken away from you*," just say with the prodigal, "*I will arise and go to my Father!*" "Look not behind you, *neither continue in all the plains.*" And as you cut the cord that binds you to earth, you will hear it said: "*Well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joys of thy Lord.*" Dread not the pain of dying, for "*these light afflictions which are but for a moment will work out for you a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.*" Remember: you are commanded to "*deny yourself*" and "*endure hardness as a good soldier*," with the promise: "*He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.*" If your hand trembles at the thought of the deed, or your heart grows faint, "*add to your faith courage*," then "*fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life.*" And since it is evident that "*He that is dead is freed from sin*," why not "*go and sin no more?*" exclaiming with the apostle: "*Shall we continue in sin?—God forbid.*" "*To die is gain*," and "*to depart and be with Christ is far better.*" You would thus literally "*put off the old man with his deeds*," and "*crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts*," if my friend's style of applying scripture be correct. The testimony of Paul would then be fulfilled, "*Old things would pass away, and behold all things would become new.*"

But enough of this, I can prove any thing from the Bible, by adopting the liscence of quoting and applying scripture made use of by my opponent.

But he has finally made a calculation of the just amount of punishment due for transgression. Sin, he tells us, is finite, and hence finite punishment or punishment of a temporal character, is all that justice demands. He also informs us that actions in time cannot, in any case, affect us in eternity! But let me ask my erudite friend if the sufferings and death of Messiah were not actions performed in time? and if they do not in their effects and consequences extend into and affect us in erternity? He will and must answer yes· for Universalists, as well as others, admit that our future and endless felicity depends entirely as far as merit is concerned upon the actions of Christ here on earth. The apostle recognizes this when he says: "*If in this life only*, we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Now if Christ's actions toward us in time extend into eternity, and in their effects endure forever; are not the actions of men which *caused those actions* on the part of Christ, equal in duration? The audience must see the pertinancy of this inquiry. My opponent is

compelled to take one of two grounds and I know not which he will prefer, either that Christ was an infinite being; or else that he was a being finite like ourselves. If he adopt the former, it proves to a demonstration that sin is infinite from the fact that it cost the life's blood of the infinite Son of God to take it away; and still, even this cannot be done by this infinite remedy without the exertion and co-operation of the finite power of man: and consequently if one sin is so much more than infinite, that it requires an infinite and finite exertion combined to overcome it; how much more than infinite would be ten thousand crimes or a whole lifetime spent in rebellion against Jehovah? If my opponent will work this sum out by the single rule of three, and give us the answer, the audience can then judge something of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. He can state the question thus: As one sin is to finite power over and above infinity; so are 10,000 sins to the answer!

But should he choose the second ground, that Christ was only a finite being like ourselves; then it proves that a finite being can perform a single act which will have not only an infinite and endless effect, but will produce that same effect in millions of cases,—all that will be eternally saved by his death. Now if one finite act can produce effects equal to *millions of infinities;* what amount of consequence will 10,000 finite acts produce? This sum can also be ciphered out by the same rule and according to the same statement.

My opponent contends that punishment should always be proportioned to sin. I admit it, and hence punishment must be infinite, for, according to the foregoing argument such is the case with sin. And it cannot be otherwise than infinite for it is committed against the infinite God: and as certain as the infinite Jehovah is offended at the sins of men, so certain is it an infinite offense. Can an infinite God be offended and that offense be finite? Impossible. If my opponent should assume that those sins which have "grieved," "insulted," "provoked," and "offended" the Almighty, and which make him "angry with the wicked every day," are only finite; it proves, to a demonstration, that the Almighty Jehovah is but a finite being! Thus my friend is compelled to admit the transgressions of men infinite or else deny the infinity of God. Punishment, as my opponent admits, is a *motive* to deter men from the commission of crime. Query: Is this motive held out by infinite wisdom, power, and goodness? If so, is it an infinite motive? If so, must it not be infinite punishment? It certainly must; as *finite* punishment cannot be an *infinite* motive. From this it follows that sin is an infinite evil; and this is in exact accordance with the Bible: "Is not thy wickedness great and thine *iniquities infinite?*" [Job 22. 5.] My opponent is compelled on his own principles to admit infinite punishment, for punishment and sin, he tells us, must always be in proportion with each other; and as we have positive scripture testimony that one is infinite, the other must therefore be also.

But if sin be not infinite, where was the necessity of an infinite God bringing into requisition his infinite wisdom, power and goodness, to put a check to it? If it were only finite, it would have required only a finite sacrifice, such as a lamb or bullock to annul it. But it was of such a heinous character that it caused an infinite God to exercise his infinite benevolence in sending down an infinite Saviour, who offered himself up an infinite sacrifice, to make an infinite atonement, in order to bring about an infinite system of reconciliation, that men, being redeemed from their infinite transgressions, might be made heirs to an infinite inheritance, and enjoy it forever in the presence of the infinite God!

But if *sin* be measured by *man*, as my friend thinks it should be, still it does nothing for the doctrine he is advocating; for man is not finite, only as regards his mortal body. His soul or spirit is an infinite entity, and will endure as long as God himself; and as we have before proved that sin originates and has its seat in the soul, it must therefore be the product of an infinite entity; and if my opponent's logic be correct, that our sins are like ourselves, it is a demonstration in favor of the infinity of sin! But if sin be like its author, as my friend contends, then he is bound by another and overwhelming consideration to admit its infinity; for he has contended, since the commencement of this discussion, that the infinite God was the author of it! Hence, let him turn which way he will, there is no dodging this conclusion. He may tell me, that sins committed under the old covenant were punished only with temporal destruction, and that consequently they were only finite. But suppose we should admit, that sins committed against Moses were of a finite character: this does not settle the question with regard to sins committed against Christ! The apostle, in speaking of Christ says: "For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch, as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house." [Heb. 3. 3.] From this it is evident that Christ is as much greater than Moses as God is greater than man. This certainly makes an infinite difference. Hence, punishment for sins committed against Christ must be as much severer than that inflicted for sins committed against Moses, as Christ is superior to Moses: and as there is an infinite difference between them, it follows that sins against Christ are infinite, and must necessarily deserve infinite punishment. The true ground upon this subject has been lost sight of by my opponent entirely. He supposes that sin must be measured by the dignity of the offender. But such is not the fact. The meanest slave might murder the king upon his throne as easily as the most dignified nobleman in the realm. Hence the heinousness or enormity of sin consists altogether in the dignity of the being insulted. "He that despised Moses's law," says Paul, "died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of *how much sorer punishment* suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who *hath trodden* under foot the Son of God?" [Heb. 10. 28. 29.] I

answer: just as much *sorer* than death without mercy (which was the very utmost extent of finite punishment,) as the Creator is superior to the thing created; or as a man is more dignified than a piece of wood! From this and the foregoing arguments, it must be evident to this audience, as well as to my worthy opponent, that sins committed against God and against Christ are infinite offenses, and as such must deserve infinite punishment. I have thus considered all the points in my opponent's last speech, that I now recollect, and will therefore give way to hear his defense.

## ALPHA'S SIXTH SPEECH.

Gentlemen and ladies: I am still alive; notwithstang my opponent manifests such uncommon anxiety that I should commit suicide. I presume he would be glad to get rid of me, but I intend to live long enough to show the absurdity of some of his reasoning at least.

He informed us that he had replied to all my arguments, or all he could recollect! He must have a treacherous memory, for the principal argument upon which I relied in my last speech, and which I introduced in the one preceding that, has been passed by with neglect. Those points which he thought he could succeed in turning into ridicule he has assailed, and he unquestionably deserves a medal for the extraordinary dexterity and sagacity with which he can build up cob-houses that appear to be substantial. But the argument to which he has not replied is based upon the true and scriptural design of punishment. I have quoted several texts of scripture to prove that punishment is always for the good of the offender, and that it has no other object in view than his reformation. I shall not consume time to requote those texts, as I presume the audience recollect them if my friend does not. I intend, however, to urge the point still further.

As punishment is to be inflicted for the good of the offender, it will continue till he is reformed and no longer. This is self-evident. Whenever punishment goes beyond reformation, or ceases to be corrective, it is unjust and vindictive. But we are not to look upon God as possessing such a character as that view of the subject holds forth: neither could we love him if we did. My opponent would make us believe that the God of love, the Father of mercies, and the God of all consolation and comfort, was a being to be feared; but this shows the state of his own soul. His love is not yet perfect; for John says: "There is no fear in love but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love." (1 Jo. 4. 18.) I wish to make the people understand that God is not the being he is represented to be: that although he will punish the wicked, yet he is not to be feared, since, like a kind father he chastises us for our profit that we might be partakers of his holiness! God never holds out punishment as an end, but always as a means. Here is where my friend misunderstands the whole econo-

my of salvation. He looks at punishment as an evil of a positive character: but if an evil at all, it is a necessary evil, as no man can be reformed without it. It is the true panacea by which the malady of sin is healed. This is the only reasonable view of this subject; and in no other way could God manifest the character of a father than to punish us for our benefit. What father would see his child weltering in flames and not take him out when he had the power to do it, even supposing the child had trangressed his commands? If the father should not make his son happy and deliver him from his suffering it would be either because he lacked the ability or disposition. And as God lacks neither ability nor disposition, he must therefore make all his creatures as happy as they are capable of being. This being true, down goes the cruel dogma of endless torment.

But Nature, as well as reason, is in favor of universal salvation; and opposed to the doctrine of my opponent. In Nature we can see the reason of things and the adaptation of means to ends, but what is the use of a devil and a future endless hell? No man can account for this, yet it is but one absurdity out of a great multitude which no man could number attending the teachings of orthodoxy. Look how God has garnished the earth and the heavens with riches and beauty. See how he pours down the refreshing showers of rain, and makes the earth to bring forth food to all alike. Here you see none of this partiality in the works of Nature, which is continually preached up by our opponents as the works and ways of God. Hence, I claim Nature as a strong and even unanswerable proof in favor of my position.

But so many facts have presented themselves to my mind, that I came near forgetting the main argument in this discussion upon which, in fact, I started out: that is, *the foreknowledge of God!* When the discussion commenced, I had intended to make this my strong ground; but I have been led into so many other matters and side issues, that it is almost too late (as I have but one speech more) to carry out the argument as I could wish. But I shall endeavor to give an idea of its bearing upon the issue of this discussion.

I have taken the ground before; but I take it now especially, that foreknowledge does and must imply foreordination; or it involves the law that whenever God foreknew that a thing would take place he that instant must have decreed it. My friend may urge, as one of his colleagues did in a recent discussion, that the astronomer may foreknow and foresee that an eclipse will darken the sun at such an hour and at such a minute, yet his foreknowing it will not have the least tendency toward bringing about that event! I admit this to be correct: yet it is not a parallel case by any means. The astronomer had no hand in establishing the laws by which that eclipse was brought upon the sun at that time. But suppose the astronomer had *created the sun and the* moon, and knew at the time he was making

them that this eclipse would occur at this precise time; and not only so, but suppose that even then he established the law which he knew would certainly result in that very manner: I ask, did he not design such an event to take place? You must, my fellow-citizens, admit that he did. The man who makes a watch, knowing when he is constructing it, that it will run down in twelve hours after being wound up, designs it to run that long and no longer. This is an undeniable fact. Thus it was when God made man. He knew, when the idea of the creation of man was first conceived, all the various and inconceivably complicated circumstances and vicissitudes through which he would pass from his creation to the most remote period of his existence. When God said, "Let us make man," he knew exactly his destiny, and he made him in such a way and gave him such powers and propensities as he knew would lead him into just such a course of conduct; and hence he must, knowing all these circumstances, have designed him to be just what he is, and just what he ever will be to all eternity. If any are the eternal losers by their existence, God knew it before their creation, and I do contend, that if God created them with this certain knowledge before him, he must have designed them to be, whatever in the history of time and eternity he knew they would be. From this there is no way of escape. If any one can evade this conclusion, my opponent is undoubtedly the man; for he has twisted out of as many hard places since the commencement of this debate, I'll venture the assertion, as any other man ever did in so short a time. I have several other things to present, in connection with this last argument, but will reserve them for the next, which will be my closing speech. I now have the foundation effectually laid for overturning the whole citadel of orthodoxy, and if that foundation be not shattered, then my friend's argument must hopelessly break down. But before taking my seat I must notice a single argument of my friend that really appeared formidable, and no doubt made a very strong impression on the minds of this audience. It was, without doubt, the most forcible point made in his last speech. It was based upon the supposed *infinite* nature of sin and punishment, and consisted chiefly in a quotation from the Book of Job, in which the question is asked, "Are not thine *iniquities infinite*?" Now it happens that this is not divine testimony at all! It is the language of Eliphaz, the Tamanite, one of Job's false comforters, who applies this charge of "*infinite*" sin to this good man. Of course it is *false*, as were most of the other charges made against Job by these pretended but calumniating friends. In other words it was a *falsehood*, though recorded in the Bible, as is the orthodox doctrine of an *infinite hell*, of which this text forms the basis. My friend had better study the Bible before he quotes Scripture to fasten upon the Father of Mercies a character that would disgrace a Nero, and make every merciful man loathe him. I expect, before he gets through, that he will quote the words

of the *devil*, which are also frequently recorded in the Bible, and try to make you believe them to be good Scripture testimony. I have thus by one move produced a checkmate to my friend's great hobby of *infinite* punishment. Will he give it up? But I close my remarks for the present to hear what he may have to say in explanation.

## OMEGA'S SIXTH REPLY.

Respected audience: I say with my opponent, that I hope you will bear in mind the argument last presented, as well as that on the foreknowledge of God, until the close of my speech; when I shall take it into consideration. The whole argument on the design of punishment is now presented, and it is as well fortified as I ever heard it. I either lost my notes of that argument, or omitted taking any, and this is the reason why I did not notice it in my last rejoinder. I am now glad that such was the case, for not more than one half of the argument had been presented.

My friend has taken the broad ground that all punishment is disciplinary, and inflicted for the reformation of the offender. He quotes a text as proof: "Thou shalt consider in thy heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." This is true: When God administers chastisement, or disciplinary punishment, he does it upon the same principle that a father would correct his son. But how is it, when God takes vengeance upon the wicked? Is this chastisement? By no means. This portion of the Bible and of God's character as a sovereign, Universalists totally ignore. The Apostle Paul makes it obligatory upon the father to correct his son for his benefit: "For what son is he whom the father chasteneth not!" But he forbids man to take vengeance in any case whatever, assuring him that "Vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord." It is God's prerogative alone, and man's only when his power to exercise it comes from God's authority. This demonstrates that *vengeance* and *chastisement* are two things entirely different. If not, why enjoin one, and so pointedly forbid the other? From this it follows (as chastisement is for the benefit of the punished, and vengeance is an entirely different thing,) that vengeance is not executed for the good of the offender; and as vengeance is punishment it follows beyond controversy that my friend is wofully deceived when he contends that all punisment is disciplinary. If vengeance be for the good of those upon whom it is inflicted, why did the apostle forbid men to inflict it? Did he forbid men to do good to their neighbors? No, for he commands us to "do good to all men," and if vengeance be for the good of man, we have a right to inflict it under proper restrictions.

My friend is altogether mistaken when he supposes the reformation of the offender to be the only design of punishment. Punishment may be inflicted for three other legitimate objects, under any *well organized* government, and these objects are necessary and es-

sential to the existence of any government in its relations to the governor and subjects. They are 1. To sustain the honor and dignity of the authority by which the government is established and administered. 2. To guard the innocent from the danger to which they would be exposed by letting the wicked go unpunished. 3. To be an example to those who should afterward live ungodly: and 4. The reformation of the offender. My opponent appears to be a man of one idea; hence he can see but one design in punishment when there are absolutely four! Whenever God punishes the wicked for trampling under foot his authority, he does it for the purpose of sustaining his majesty and honor, and such punishment can be strictly termed vengeance. But if its object be simply to reform the offender, it is called chastisement, which is as far from the idea of vengeance as day is from night. In not one instance where vengeance occurs in the Bible was it for the good of the punished; neither is chastisement ever called vengeance: but its first and leading object was to sustain the character and dignity of God, as a wise and just Lawgiver. Were the Sodomites, for example, punished for their reformation? Not exactly; neither was their punishment ever called chastisement. Jude says: they were "set forth for *an example*, suffering the *vengeance* of eternal fire." [Jude 7.] The wicked who fell in the wilderness were not punished for their benefit, but to sustain the honor of God and as an example to others: "All these things happened unto them for *ensamples*, and they are written for our *admonition*." [1 Cor. 10. 11.] In each of these cases the punishment was not only an example to others, but also for the purpose of delivering the godly out of temptation. If pouring down fire and brimstone upon the heads of men till they are burned up be designed for their benefit, in order to reform them; it is certainly a reformation with a *vengeance!* But the final destruction of the wicked at the end of time, it may be said, can neither be an example to others who would afterward life ungodly, nor add to the safety of the saints in heaven. But who knows but that myriads of those worlds, which are now swimming in the void immense, will exist ages after the dissolution of this earth, whose inhabitants will need something of this kind as a warning? And who knows but that the final destruction of the wicked will serve to them, as the history of Sodom and Gomorrah and the unalterable destiny of fallen angels do to us? As regards the safety of the saints in heaven, of which my friend speaks, it depends somewhat on the truth or falsity of Universalism. I conclude that if the wicked, who are so incorrigible here as to confront the power and authority of God and to endanger the peace and safety of the saints, should be involuntarily taken to heaven, the saints might be no safer there than here. But be this as it may, the veracity and sovereignty of God must be sustained; and he has threatened the wicked with an everlasting destruction from his presence, as an infinite motive to deter from the

commission of crime, and he is bound to inflict it as it is impossible for him to lie.

But my opponent says, that whenever punishment ceases to be corrective it becomes unjust and vindictive. He contends also, that God punishes the wicked every day, as long as they remain wicked. These two declarations prove positively that God is cruel and unjust, if he punish the wicked at all; for the apostle says: "Evil men and seducers wax *worse* and *worse* deceiving and being deceived." [2 Tim. 3. 13.] Hence God dare not inflict punishment upon such characters upon the peril of his justice; for they would only grow *worse* and *worse* under it, and consequently it would not be corrective! Now let my friend avoid this difficulty if he can. God will not punish a man who will not be reformed by it; and such cases there are in almost innumerable instances. All wicked men and seducers, because punishment in their case would not be corrective, must slip off to heaven without any punishment at all when they happen to die; for God would be unjust and vindictive in punishing them when their punishment, so far from being corrective, would only make them worse instead of better. Here then my friend's doctrine lets the profligate conscience-seared wretch run at large, free from all restraint, because God dare not punish him since the punishment would not make him better! But he may say God designed the punishment to reform him, and hence it is not unjust. What! God designed it to reform him and that design be frustrated? Why then may not the design of universal salvation be frustrated upon the same principle by the wickedness of men?

If all punishment be designed only as a mild chastisement as my friend argues, it is singular that God should express himself as he does, when declaring his intention to punish the wicked. Suppose a father is about to correct his son for misconduct, and designs only administering a few disciplinary stripes for the boy's benefit in order to reform him, and should make use of the following language: Come up here, sir: "Vengeance is mine, and I will repay it." "My fury is waxed hot, and my wrath is kindled against you," even "wrath without mixture." "Good were it for you had you never been born;" for "I will never forgive you, in this world, nor in that which is to come;" but will "punish you with an everlasting destruction in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is no quenched, and where you shall be tormented day and night forever and ever, with hypocrites and unbelievers; and where there shall be weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth." You "shall have no rest day nor night;" for you shall experience a far sorer punishment than dying without mercy, when "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" shall be poured upon you, and you shall hear me say: "Depart from me thou cursed boy, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels!" One of three conclusions must the boy come to, when

he hears his father make such horrible threats: either 1. That he has become insane: or 2. That he is jesting; or 3. That endless damnation is to be his doom, just as certain as his father has power to inflict it! No man would think, that by such terrible threatenings he meant anything less than eternal perdition. Yet my opponent would endeavor to make us think that all such fearful threatenings, which are but a fraction of what the Bible contains, "only convey the idea of a mild disciplinary correction designed solely for the benefit of the transgressor"!

But if it be true, as my friend argues, that all punishment is designed for the good of the offender, as a panacea to cure the disease of sin; then all the *curses* of the Bible are immediately converted into *blessings!* Would my opponent, if he were very sick, consider that the physician was going to *curse* him if he should come to administer medicine in order to cure his disease? According to this doctrine, when God threatens men with punishment, it signifies in every case a *blessing*, as it is invariably designed for the benefit of the punished to cure them of the disease of sin. Let us try a few texts. Thus we read: "Depart from me ye *blessed* into everlasting *medicine*, prepared for the devil and his angels." [Math. 25. 41.] "Who shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a *blessing*." [Mal. 4. 6.] Sodom and Gomorrah were "set forth for an example, *enjoying* the *blessing* of eternal *medicine*." [Jude 8.] "The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers and whoremongers, and sorcerers and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which *is blessed* with *medicine* and *antidote*, which is the second *dose*." [Rev. 21. 8.] "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming *medicine*, pouring *mercy* on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be *blessed* with an everlasting *panacea* from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." [2 Th. 1. 7-9.] What a *blessed* figure Uiversalism cuts with the Bible! But if all curses are blessings, why not like a good rule, let it work both ways? Thus: "Then shall the King say to them on his right hand: Come ye *cursed* of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." [Math. 25. 34.] "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be *cursed*." [Gen. 22. 18.] "*Cursed* are the dead that die in the Lord." [Rev. 14. 13.] "*Cursed* are the poor in spirit. for their's is the kingdom of heaven." "*Cursed* are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.," &c. [Math. 5. 3-9.] In the language of my opponent: How transcendantly sublime is the faith of Universalism?

But he tells us that punishment is the legitimate cure for sin, and that no man can be reformed without it. Let us now look at a case: A man lives in sin all his life, grows *worse* and *worse* the longer he lives and is punished all the while; and finally, when he becomes

most depraved, and consequently most deserving of punishment, he is struck instantly dead in the very act of committing murder, and thus goes into eternity uncured—unreformed. Now since no man can be reformed without punishment, it follows that this man will remain unreformed to all eternity; for my friend has argued strongly since the commencement of this discussion, that punishment will not extend into eternity! Hence, all those who die in their sins, or die unreformed, will remain sinners forever, and as sin and misery are inseparably connected, as my friend insists, it proves endless misery to a demonstration! But should he abandon his old ground and admit that punishment may extend into eternity in order to reform those who go there unreformed, still it will not better the matter in the least; for, as we have a right to infer what will be from what has been, we can draw no other conclusion than that wicked men there will continue to grow *worse* and *worse* notwithstanding all their punishment, for such verily was the case with them here! Will he tell us that surrounding circumstances will be more favorable in that world for their reformation than they are here? Not so: for as one man goes into the future state unreformed, myriads of others will go in the same way and by association make their enviroment the same. They can thus, instead of being weakened, assist and co-operate with each other in carrying out their schemes of wickedness until they get as bad as the devil, who would be a difficult candidate for reformation.

But my opponent tells us that punishment is always a *means*, never an *end!* In this again he is mistaken. Paul says, concerning the wicked, who were past being reformed, either in time or in eternity: "*Whose end is destruction?*" [Phil. 3. 18.] Disciplinary punishment is always a means, I admit; but when punishment amounts to destruction, it is no longer disciplinary, neither is it any longer a *means;* but is in reality the *end* which the wicked bring upon themselves by their evil conduct. The chastisement spoken of in the 12th of Hebrews, which my friend quoted was punishment only in its character as a means: for the apostle says it is "for our profit that we might be partakers of his holiness." But who is it that will be partakers of his holiness through this chastisement? My opponent did not quote the whole text or it would need no remark. "Nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness *to them who are exercised thereby.*" But how about those who will not be *exercised* by it? They will not be reformed by it, of course, and consequently it will not work in them the peaceable fruits of righteousness!

But the strongest reason of all why punishment is not always for the good of the sinner, is because it is sometimes inflicted without *mercy.* If it were for his good it would, as I have already shown, be a blessing, and would consequently be an exhibition of the purest *mercy. Such is the* case with all disciplinary punishment or chas-

tisement; it is administered in mercy; but when it amounts to vengeance it is administered in *justice*, and *mercy* is utterly excluded: and hence it cannot be for the benefit of the transgressor. Am I sustained by the law and the testimony? "He that despised Moses' law *died without mercy.*" [Heb. 10. 28.] Was this for his benefit? Again: "Therefore will I also deal in *fury* [*vengeance,*] mine eye shall not spare, neither will I have *pity.*" [Ezek. 8. 18.] When God deals in *fury* or exercises *vengeance*, it is not as a father chastises his son, for it is without *mercy* and without *pity!* Is such punishment for the good of the punished?

But my friend asks: would a father see his son perishing in the flames and not help him out if he could? and has not our heavenly Father as much compassion as man? All I have to do, in answering that question, is to get my friend to try the experiment. Let him get drunk and fall into the fire and see how long he would lay there before the Almighty would pull him out! His earthly father might take compassion on him and help him; yet God does not and will not do it. Perhaps at this very instant there is a ship in a storm with hundreds of passengers about going to the bottom of the ocean. How easily could the Almighty say: "Peace, be still;" yet he does not and they go down amid cries for mercy. Would not the President of the United States have stayed the wind and calmed the tempestuous ocean had he possessed power adequate to the task? He certainly would, and so would any man in this audience who had not a relative on board; yet the Almighty does not, although one word would smoothe the bosom of the boisterous deep as the polished surface of a mirror.

My friend concludes, that if God does not make all men as happy as they can be, he lacks either ability or disposition. But God has just as much ability and disposition now as he ever will have; and thus the conclusion is unavoidable that all men are just now as happy as they ever can be. Hence, my opponent is compelled to admit that God cannot possibly make some men happier than to keep them in their sins forever!

But the feelings of an earthly father are no test at all of the feelings of God. It is the natural feeling and inclination of all earthly fathers to screen their sons from the demands of justice when they have been guilty of capital offenses. But who can impute such a disposition to Jehovah? He once passed a law against this very inclination on the part of earthly parents, which proves that in cases of stubbornness and rebellion, justice demands more than *chastisement.* Here is the law: "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son which will not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother, and that when they have *chastened* him will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him and bring him out unto the elders of the city, and unto the gate of his place: and they shall say unto the elders of the city: this our son

is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice, he is a glutton and he is a drunkard: and all the men of his city *shall stone him with stones that he die.*" [Deut. 21. 18–21.] Thus, after chastisement was resorted to and it proved ineffectual, he must then die without mercy, or in other words, vengeance must be exercised. My friend would hardly select such a father to prove his doctrine by; yet it is precisely what God commanded! It is certainly an uphill business, and my opponent has found it so, to prove Universalism from our limited ideas of God. The Sodomites might have reasoned the eyes out of the angels, when they came to warn them of their destiny and to protect Lot from their abominable conduct. Why, God is too good, they might have preached, to destroy us. What! talk about a God of love,—the Father of our spirits, pouring down fire and brimstone upon the heads of his children! Not so: here we are,—we did not create ourselves, and God knew before he made us what would be our destiny, and had he seen that such was to be our end he would most certainly have withheld our existence! More than this:—God does not punish only for the good of the offender, in order to secure his reformation: and what good would it do us to be roasted to death in fire and brimstone? How could such punishment produce reformation? What earthly father would be so cruel as to pour fire and brimstone upon the heads of his offspring and see them burn to death? How much less would God who is infinitely better than any earthly parent can possibly be? Thus could the Sodomites have philosophized, moralized, dogmatized, and logically inferred that the angels were preaching a false doctrine, and that no such dreadful calamity should come upon them! But the fire and brimstone came, nevertheless, and burnt up their philosophy and their logic, and left them naked and exposed to the vengeance of infinite wrath!

My friend comes to the conclusion that God is not to be feared. This is perfectly compatible with his other views: for if God punishes men only for their good, where is there necessity or ground for fear? But here again, is my opponent in direct opposition to the whole tenor of revelation? "Work out your salvation with *fear* and *trembling.*" [Phil. 2. 12.] "Let us therefore *fear*, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." [Heb. 4. 1.]—"Knowing therefore the *terror* of the Lord, we persuade men." [2 Cor. 5. 11.] "Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly *fear*, for our God is a *consuming fire.*" [Heb. 12. 28, 29.] "It is a *fearful* thing to fall into the hands of the living God." [Ibid. 10.31.] Such is a sample of the testimony in direct contradiction to my friend's theory: and can it be possible that a doctrine so diametrically opposed to the Bible can be the truth? It some how finds advocates, true or false.

But there is a text in John, which my friend thinks in favor of the *position that God is* not to be feared. "There is no fear in love;

but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment: he that feareth is not made perfect in love." [1 John 4. 18.] But suppose this does teach what he thinks it does; it would only be flatly arraying the Bible against itself. However, the apostle, in the verse preceding this text, tells us what he is speaking of, and what it is that the Christian does not fear. "Herein is our love made perfect that we may have boldness in *the day of judgment.*" [Verse 17.] No man who loves the Lord and obeys his commandments will *fear* the day of *judgment* :—"There is no (*such*) fear in love; but perfect love casteth out (*all such*) fear: because (*such*) fear hath torment: he that feareth (*the day of judgment,*) is not made perfect in love." My friend would do well to take into consideration when he reads a text what the writer has before him.

But Nature, he thinks, is against me. God sends down the refreshing showers of rain, and makes the sun to shine on all alike. True but what good will all this do us, if we do not improve it in cultivating the soil? "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold; he shall therefore beg for bread in harvest and have nothing." Notwithstanding "God makes his sun to shine on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust," yet he will let a man starve to death, if he will not attend to the ordinances of Nature, and receive the bounties of providence in God's own appointed way! Just so, has God made provisions for the spiritual necessities of man in the plan of salvation. The Sun of Righteousness was given for us all, but the man who will not receive his benefits, by attending to the ordinances of religion, will be as certain of losing all interest in Christ, and consequently eternal felicity, as the man is certain of death, who will not comply with the demands or ordinances of Nature! Hence, Nature is against Universalism; and as the God of Nature is the God of the Bible, my friend had better abandon his doctrine. All the blessings of providence are suspended upon *conditions*, although the blessings themselves are freely provided, and extended to all alike. How then can my opponent infer an unconditional heaven from the system and operations of Nature? I fear his purblind theology will lead him into difficulty, unless he come out frankly and give it up.

Every thing in Nature goes to prove, first the preparation, and then the enjoyment of the blessing. Spring is the time to prepare for summer, summer for autumn, and autumn for winter. That which Nature has allotted to spring, is not to be put off till summer; and the business of summer cannot be delayed till autumn; neither can the work assigned to autumn be postponed till winter. Thus every thing in Nature sustains the doctrine of probation. Suppose my friend should act consistently and preach the same doctrine concerning Nature that he does with reference to the Bible. He convenes a congregation of farmers and commences: "God is [illegible]

nite in wisdom, power and goodness;—he is good to all, and his tender mercy is over all his works. God is love, and loves all men alike, and will be infinitely better to all mankind than an earthly father can be to his own offspring; and hence you will all be certain of an abundant harvest next fall whether you plow, sow your grain, or make any preparations for it or not. You remember the covenant with Noah: that 'summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, should continue,' and will God be guilty of breaking his own covenant? By no means: harvest must then certainly continue. It cannot be otherwise; for how can God be good to all if he should give them nothing to eat and thus let them starve. It is true, it is right and best for you to work and cultivate the soil, for God has commanded it, and such exercise is necessary in order to your enjoyment of good health before harvest. You will feel better to exercise yourselves, and you will have a clear conscience, and it will keep you out of mischief. But still an abundant harvest is just as certain if you do not work as if you do," &c. No doubt the farmers would at once be struck with the idea of getting such a cheap harvest: and although they might all be willing to admit that men would feel better to work than to be idle, yet they would be very apt to play, notwithstanding; for who would have so little sense as to plow and sow, when he was just as certain of a crop without it? It is true, they might occasionally feel hungry before harvest, if they did not work; but still, the absolute certainty of plenty so near at hand would make their hunger easy to be borne; and knowing that God was so good, that he would not let them die, they would play on, and contend that if they should be hungry it would only give them a better appetite for the coming feast! And they would even laugh at their deluded neighbor who had so little brains as to think he must get his bread by the sweat of his face! But when harvest comes, my opponent's converts go out to their fields expecting to find them lined with the rich products of Nature; but, to the utter destruction of their false hopes, they see nothing but a barren waste: whilst their orthodox neighbors are thrusting in their sickles and gathering the golden sheaves! But these Universalian farmers, poor fellows, must starve to death, notwithstanding God is *love*, and notwithstanding his infinite *wisdom*, *power* and *goodness!*

But my opponent thinks all things in Nature very easily accounted for: but he can't see the use of a future hell! But suppose I could not account for a future hell, that is no sign that God could not. The man who looks upon a steam-engine could not, perhaps, see the use nor propriety of all the wheels, balls, pivots, screws, rods, &c., whilst the engineer, at a single glance, could understand the use and adaptation of every part. The only idea I have of a future hell is, that it was "prepared for the devil and his angels." Ah, say you, that's *it:* not for *men!* True enough, it was not prepared for men, but a

great number of men I fear have prepared themselves for it; and many who, like my opponent, are very curious to find out the use of a future hell, may find out soon enough.

But finally, my friend has gone back to the old starting place, and brought up a reinforcement on the foreknowledge of God. This appears to be his last great resort. Hence, if this breaks down his cause must fail. He lays down the position that God, foreknowing that man would sin, and then creating him with this certain foreknowledge before him was virtually designing him to sin! I have frequently thought of this difficulty before, and I freely confess that I have never been able fully to dispose of it, if those premises are fully granted, neither did I ever find a man who could. But we have examined the doctrine of God's decreeing sin, and then punishing man for doing what he could not help; and we have found that it leads to innumerable absurdities and contradictions which neither I nor my opponent can reconcile. This he has acknowledged since the commencement of this debate. Hence, that cannot be the true ground of explanation in trying to harmonize God's infinite attributes; and as I cannot dispose of my opponent's conclusions, there is no other way possible for both of us to avoid difficulties and absurdities except to deny his premises, and take the ground, that God did not, neither was it necessary for him to foreknow that man would sin when he created him. This may be a *new* position to my opponent as well as to many in this audience, and one at first blush very objectionable to the general conception of the perfections of Diety. But lay aside your prejudices, all of you, until the point is fairly argued, and then decide. Now do not understand me to say, that God could not have known that man would sin, had he been disposed to know it; this is not my ground; but my position is, that it was not necessary for him to know it, and that he had power enough to keep from it! My opponent may accuse me of limiting the knowledge of God. But I do not; yet I do contend that God had power sufficient to limit his own knowledge in any specific direction he might choose, and that he has exercised that power in certain cases. But I shall not anticipate my opponent's objections. He shall have the privilege of doing his very best, in his closing speech. I wish it to be remembered, however, that my opponent boasted, at the commencement of this discussion, that he was no *limitarian!* No, no, not he; yet he is the very man who *limits* the power of God to such an extent that he *cannot possibly* keep from foreknowing every event that takes place! Yes: he is no *limitarian*, yet God *must* know from all eternity every thing that comes to pass, and that he had not power sufficient to keep a single thing out of his mind had he wished to! Yes, my friend is no *limitarian;* yet he teaches, that by some irresistible necessity or fatality over which God has not, and *cannot* exercise control, he is compelled to foreknow every

conceivable circumstance that would occur, even if the destiny of his throne should be at stake! Now let my ground be fairly understood,—that God has power to foreknow an event, or he has power to keep it out of his mind, whichever he prefers; and if my opponent deny him this power, then he is the *limitarian*, and not I! Neither do I take the position, that the attribute of knowledge is not *infinite*. It would be an absurdity to suppose that a finite attribute could belong to the *infinite* God! But the attribute of power is just as infinite as that of knowledge; and still it does not necessarily follow because God's power is infinite, that he must therefore do everything that is or that ever has been done: for man has done many things that God did not do, nor ever will do to all eternity. By infinite power we understand, not that God must necessarily do every thing, but simply the infinite ability to do any thing he pleases, or any thing that will be compatible with his other attributes. Thus we understand the infinite attribute of knowledge, not the knowing of everything but simply the infinite ability to know any thing and every thing that will harmonize with his other attributes and the nature of his moral government. Or, in other words, my position is, that God can *do* what he pleases, and *know* what he pleases, and that no man can "find out the Almighty unto *perfection*." This view of the subject will, if sustained, not only effectually break down Universalism, but it will exonerate the character of God from the aspersions my opponent's doctrine is calculated to throw upon it, by making him the arbitrary author of sin and all our woes.

But, before closing I wish to present some four or five scripture testimonies in favor of my position, that certain things have occurred that God did not foreknow; and then hear my friend dispose of them if he can. "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and daughters in the fire which I commanded them not, *neither came it into my heart*." [Jer. 7. 31.] This testimony is pointed and emphatic that those abominations which the Jews practised never entered into God's heart. This is most strange when he had decreed them from all eternity! "And the Lord said, because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous: I will go down now, *and see* whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me, *and if not I will know!*" [Gen. 18. 20.] Thus, according to this testimony, the Almighty did not know how bad the Sodomites had acted until he went down to see! This, to the mind of some, might convey rather a diminutive idea of God's omniscience; but it is not to be supposed that he could not have known without going down to see; and hence, it gives a far more exalted idea of the perfections of Jehovah to suppose him a being capable of *doing* and *knowing* what he pleases,—making use of means or working without them, just as he sees cause,—than the *theory which chains* down the Almighty with the fetters of fatality

to the stake of the absolute necessity of foreknowing every event, giving him the power to do what he pleases, whilst over the attribute of knowledge he cannot exercise the least control! But we have another evidence which is even more pointed than the one just referred to. "*And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth*, and it *grieved* him at his heart: and the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." [Gen. 6. 6. 7.] Now if God foreknew from all eternity that men would practise wickedness, and if this knowledge was always alike perfect and present before his mind; why did he not repent, and why was he not grieved from all eternity as well as when he saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth after the events had been accomplished? If knowing that men *had* sinned would cause the Almighty to be so grieved as to destroy them, why did not the knowledge that they *would* sin (if he really possessed it,) cause him to be so grieved as never to create them? Could God consistently seek to grieve himself? If not, why did he make man knowing, to an absolute certainty, that he would practise iniquity until he would have to repent and be grieved at the heart, and finally be compelled to destroy man whom he had created from the face of the earth? The only refuge is, that God did not know before he created man that he would sin, for the reason that he did not see fit to know it, and he had power sufficient to keep from it! Once more: "And the Lord repented of the evil, that he *thought* to do unto his people." [Ex. 23. 14.] Query: Did God *think* he would do that evil unto his people? Yes; for the Bible says so. Did he *know*, at the same time, that he would repent of it and not do it? If so, then his thoughts contradict his knowledge; which is the same thing as for the Almighty to *think* that a thing would be one way, and *know*, at the same time, that it would be exactly the reverse! But such an absurdity could not be; hence it follows, that as certain as God *thought* to bring an evil upon his people, which the Bible affirms, just so certain he did not *foreknow* that he would repent of that evil and not do it!

One other thing before taking my seat. At the close of his last speech my friend sprung on the audience what may be called an exegetical mare's nest, in his remarkable discovery that my quotation from Job on the *infinity* of sin was not Bible testimony at all, being the language of Eliphaz, one of Job's comforters, who charged the afflicted man with numerous faults of which he was not guilty, among which was that of committing "*infinite* iniquities" against God. Now it happens that we were well aware that this language was that of the false comforter, Eliphaz, and in its application to Job we have no doubt at all that it was a wicked falsehood. But this fact of incorrect application to Job by no means proves the thing charged to be untrue provided it were properly applied to real sinners against God. We state without fear of refutation that out of

a score of things charged against Job by Eliphaz not one is based upon an absolute chimera, though all might be false in their application to that man of God. As well assert that there is no such thing as "wickedness" or "iniquity," which is a part of this very charge, because it was falsely appied to Job! The devil claimed all the kingdoms of the world in his appeal to the Saviour on the Mount. Though this claim was absurdly false, it by no means proves that it was based on absolute chimeras. There surely are such things as kingdoms of this world. If there had not been, the devil would have been as big a fool as he was a liar in pretending to own them! Thus our argument for *infinite* punishment stands untouched, if Scripture language be admitted as evidence, and my friend's adroit "checkmate," as he supposed, has proved to be a "*stalemate*" that has ruined his game.

## ALPHA'S CLOSING SPEECH.

Gentlemen moderators and fellow-citizens: You have, no doubt, become wearied somewhat in listening so attentively to this discussion for so long a time without an intermission. But it will soon now come to a close, as this is my concluding address. I have endeavored since the commencement of the debate, to make short speeches, and I supposed my opponent would do the same; yet his speeches upon an average have occupied more than double the time of mine; but I will not find fault.

My opponent is the greatest quibbler (not to use an opprobious epithet) with whom I ever held a discussion. He puts me in mind of a wheel-wright in London, who put over the door of his shop: "All sorts of *twisting* and *turning* done here." I thought, when the argument on the design of punishment was presented, there was no way of evading it: but like the philosopher's stone, which turns every thing it touches into gold, so he turns every thing he touches into sophistry! When my last argument, on the foreknowledge of God, was presented, I was in anxious suspense to know in what way he would attempt to meet it: and lo! a new thing under the sun made its appearance! God did not know before he made man that he would sin! Well, this is certainly a strange doctrine, and it looks as unreasonable to me, as it is novel. For the sake of brevity, I will leave the other points which have occupied the attention of the audience, in the former part of this discussion, and let them go for what they are worth (although I had intended a brief recapitulation,) and will enter into an examination of this new theory of foreknowledge during the short time I have to occupy in this speech.

I object to the doctrine of my opponent for several considerations: 1. It would imply that the Almighty at one time was nearly an idiot, or might have been entirely destitute of knowledge! This is preposterous, and the doctrine holding forth such a sentiment, cannot,

one would think, be regarded otherwise than false. This objection, unless met, must sink the doctrine into oblivion.

2. My second objection is, that the Almighty would find out some things he did not know before and consequently would be *disappointed.* This, of itself, would be sufficient to make me disbelieve the doctrine; for what better would God be than man, if he could experience the chagrin of disappointment and surprise?

3. I object also to the doctrine, from the fact that it is a contradiction in terms, to say that God could keep from knowing a thing before he knew it that he might keep from it. As a matter of course, he must first know it before he could make up his mind not to know it! Here, then, is another absurdity, and one which condemns the peculiar notion of my opponent.

4. I object to the assumption of God's having power to curtail the attribute of knowledge, from the fact, that it necessarily leads to Atheism. If God can destroy one attribute, he can, on the same principle, destroy another and in fact destroy all his attributes, and finally destroy himself and cease to exist.

5. Another objection is, that God is *allwise,* whilst my opponent's theory makes him out only *part wise!* If he be *allwise,* then he must have foreknown from eternity every event that could possibly have occurred! Can my friend answer this difficulty? We think not.

6. I object, in the sixth place, to the view of my friend because the scriptures most pointedly teach that "God foreknew from all eternity whatsoever cometh to pass." The Lord declares by the mouth of the prophet: "I am God and there is none like me, declaring *the end from the beginning,* and from ancient times, the things that are not yet done." [Is. 46. 10.] James the apostle also testifies: "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world." [Acts 15. 18.] The Apostle Paul affirms: "*All things* are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." [Heb. 4. 13.] This testimony, with many other texts as directly to the point, goes to show that God always foreknew every possible event that could occur in the history of time and eternity!

7. I object to his doctrine (that God did not know before he made man that he would sin,) for this reason: The apostle testifies concerning Christ as a Saviour, that he "verily was *foreordained* before the *foundation of the world.*" [1 Pet. 1. 20.] Now if God before the foundation of the world, ordained Jesus Christ to be a Saviour, as the apostle here declares; then it follows that God must have known before the foundation of the world that man would need a Saviour, and this could not possibly have been had he not known that man would sin in order to have something to be saved from. This argument, when fairly presented, speaks for itself, and needs no ingenuity to make it more forcible? The fact that God ordained Christ to be a Saviour before he had created man, proves that he knew man

would need a Saviour, and have something to be saved from. Let it not be contended, to escape this difficulty, that the "foundation of the *world*," has reference to the commencement of the *age*; for this will not do. The original text strictly forbids such an exposition. The word is *cosmos*, (not *aion*,) which never signifies an *age* or *dispensation*, but in every case refers to this literal mundane sphere.

8. I object, in the eight place, to my opponent's view, because he had to pervert the text in Jeremiah to sustain it. "Which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart:" that is, neither came it into my heart to *command it!* The idea is, not that it never entered into his heart that they would do such things; but it never entered into his heart to command them to do as they did. Let this be borne in mind.

9. I object, in the ninth and last place, to the conclusions of my opponent; from the consideration that *repentance* and *grief*, when spoken of with respect to God, have not at all the same signification as when applied to man; and we cannot tell to a certainty nor draw any definite conclusion from such premises unless we are to understand *repenting* and *grieving*, when applied to God, the same as when applied to man. The above position my friend has assumed without the least evidence; whilst there is every probability as well as plain matters of fact in direct opposition to the assumption.

He should have known e'er this, that language, when applied to God is used in an accommodated sense. But he appears to be ignorant of this fact, and has based his whole argument upon an assumption which every student of the Bible should know to be fallacious.

Having now presented my objections to his theory, it appears to me impossible, that any one in this audience can believe such a contradictory assumption. It must be evident if we pay any respect to the Bible that God must have foreknown before he made man that he would sin; and also that he made him so that he must be whatever he foresaw that he would be, as his foreknowledge could not be disappointed. Hence I claim that endless punishment is out of the question. For if such a thing there be, it is according to God's good pleasure, or it would not be, as God knew from eternity whether such a thing would be needed or not. And if he had foreknown that such a disaster would have occurred in the final destiny of any of his intelligent creatures, his infinite goodness would have withheld existence from those whom he foresaw to be candidates for this interminable misery!

My opponent says but little in favor of this cruel and vindictive theory of ceaseless torture! And well he may; for what heart would not bleed, and what soul, that has ever been touched with the finger of God's love, would not revolt and shudder at the direful and horrible thought of endless woe! How dreadful the thought! And *how little do the* advocates of orthodoxy comprehend the idea con-

veyed by that word *endless!*—e-n-d-l-e-s-s t-o-r-m-e-n-t!!! Think, my audience, before you subscribe to such a heart-withering, God-dishonoring sentiment. Fancy ten thousand times ten thousand of the longest conceivable ages in futurity, and then multiply them into themselves ten thousand times, and has endless suffering come to an end? Nay verily, it has only just commenced! Then extend your imagination on a million times farther, if possible, into futurity; and then subtract all these innumerable ages from the misery of the damned, and they have just as long to writhe in ceaseless torture as when those ages of suffering first commenced!

"When these are gone, as many add to these,
As leaves, and buds, and blossoms crown the trees!
When these are gone, as many millions more,
As grains of sand upon the ocean's shore!
When these are gone, as many more shall pass,
As in the verdant field are blades of grass!
When these are gone, as many more shall rise,
As stars that gem and decorate the skies!
As many millions more their rounds shall run,
As rays of light which burst from yonder sun!
When these are gone, as many more shall glide,
As drops of water in the swelling tide!
When these are gone, as many millions more,
As moments in the millions gone before!
As many more, this mighty sum shall swell,
But still the sinner groans in endless hell!"

Great God! is such an exhibition of thy long suffering? Are such the displays of the unbounded benevolence of a compassionate Saviour?

I have never heard any man attempt to justify endless sufferings, or reconcile such a sentiment with any thing less than inexorable cruelty! And I expect nothing better of my opponent than those who have preceded him.

But I am now, fellow-citizens, through with my arguments, and if my friend can fairly dispose of the foregoing objections and difficulties and make the endless torture of the wicked appear reasonable or consistent with God's character, I am no longer a Universalist.

I close my part of this discussion, with perfect good feelings toward my opponent; and as this debate may possibly be published, I sincerely desire that nothing of an unkind or unchristian spirit may be discovered in the speeches of your humble servant. I am glad that this large and respectable audience have waited and listened so patiently to the variety of facts and arguments presented to their consideration this day; and may they ponder them impartially and make up their minds and act accordingly.

I must not forget to return my warmest gratitude to the gentlemen who have presided so impartially over our friendly discussion. May you, with all who are now present, be guided in the ways of wisdom and be preserved blameless unto the appearing of Jesus Christ.

## OMEGA'S CONCLUDING REPLY.

Respected auditors: I shall promise to detain you but for a short time. My opponent seems willing to narrow the whole subject down and risk the issues of the present question upon the nine objections which you have heard presented. I will therefore, like him, leave all previous matters to be read and decided by the public, whilst the present speech shall be particularly devoted to the consideration of the foregoing objections. 1. His first objection was, that my doctrine makes out that the Almighty at one time was nearly an "idiot." Strange indeed! Suppose the Lord at one time knew nothing at all about this earth or its inhabitants: the man who would suppose him nearly an idiot on that account, must have the most insignificant conception of Jehovah and the vastness of this universe. To suppose the Almighty a being with no other dominions and having nothing else to think about except this speck of an earth (which, if struck out of existence, would leave no more of a blank, to an eye that could encompass creation, than would a single drop of water taken from the mighty Pacific) is a far lower conception of his greatness and majesty than I had ever yet formed.

But I will now prove, according to my friend's doctrine, that the Almighty at one time was not only "*nearly*" but altogether an "idiot," to use his irreverant language. He contends that whenever a thing is foreknown it is foreordained; or in other words, that *foreknowledge* and *foreordination* imply the same thing. We admit this for the sake of the argument, and it follows, that there was a time when God foreknew nothing, as there must have been a time when nothing was ordained. This I can demonstrate. If a thing be *ordained*, there is a *time when* it is done; and if a time when it is done, there must have been a time before it was done; and if a time before it was done then it was not done from all eternity, unless eternity had a beginning. And as there was a time, according to this argument, when nothing was *ordained* or *decreed*, then it follows that there was a time when nothing was *foreknown;* for, let it be borne in mind, my opponent has repeatedly affirmed, since the commencement of this discussion, that the foreknowing and foreordaining of all events are simultaneous; or in other words, the instant a thing is foreknown it is decreed! Here, then, is my opponent caught in the meshes of his own net, and his shattering objection *reductio ad absurdum!* He is compelled to adopt one of two positions, either that God could have foreknown that man would sin without having decreed it, or else that he did not foreknow from all

eternity that man would sin, neither did he foreknow any thing else! Either ground annihilates his argument, and of course his doctrine breaks down, let him go which way he will!

2. His next objection is, that if God should find out something he did not know before, he would be disappointed. But here again he limits the Almighty. How does he know that God would be disappointed, even if he should find out something new? How does he know but that God has power enough to keep from being disappointed, even if myriad events should occur which he did not know before? And suppose he should be disappointed, how does my friend know that he would feel as we do when we are disappointed? And suppose he should; has he not power to feel thus? "He that formed the eye, can he not see? and he that formed the ear, can he not hear?" And I might ask, on the the same principle, he who gave man the susceptibility of feeling disappointed, could he not feel so too? You recollect how my opponent charged us with *limitarianism* at the commencement of this debate! "They who live in glass houses should not throw stones at their neighbors," is a maxim containing an excellent moral.

3. The third objection my friend endeavors to urge against my position is, that it is a contradiction in terms. How, he asks, can God keep from knowing a thing before he knows it that he may keep from it? I unequivocally answer, I cannot tell! But must I disbelieve all things connected with the incomprehensible God because I cannot understand them? My opponent appears to think so! But let me ask him a question which will offset this. How can God foreknow that any event will take place thousands of years previous to its accomplishment? If he will answer this difficulty I pledge my word to solve the hardest puzzle upon this subject he can invent. Is it unreasonable to suppose that the inconceivable power which so far transcends all human thought, and which enables the Almighty to look through the dark distant vista of untold myriads of ages:—is it unreasonable, I ask, to suppose that by such incomprehensible power the Almighty could keep from knowing an event even before that event ever came into his mind? One is no more unreasonable to me than the other. Eternity or future duration may be to God what distance or space is to us. Suppose an avenue a mile in length, hung with curtains, at the distance of one hundred yards from each other, hiding from view every thing beyond them. Then suppose you stand at one end of this avenue where are suspended a number of cords attached to each of these supposed curtains, which you have the privilege of raising at will. Now you have it in your power to know what is beyond the first curtain, the second, the third, or any, or all of them; or you have it in your power not to know, whichever you prefer. If you raise the curtain, you will know,—if you choose to leave it down, you will not know! Thus you would have power to keep from knowing a thing even before you knew it.

that you might keep from it! Might not the Almighty Jehovah, on the same principle, have resolved not to lift the curtain of futurity until he had accomplished the work of creation, and pronounced all things *good*? when, if any evil should occur, he would be clear of all blame, having made all in such a manner that there was no necessity for the existence of evil, and consequently the blame would fall justly upon the head of man. But when he saw that man had abused the privileges and abilities which he had conferred upon him, he lifts the curtain of futurity and devises the best plan of saving as many as possible, consistent with God's sovereignty and man's free agency. Hence, according to this view of the subject, God could keep from knowing that man would sin, and my opponent's third objection is therefore weighed in the balance and found wanting!

4. His next objection to my view of foreknowledge is, that it leads to Atheism. He concludes that if God could destroy one of his attributes he could destroy all, and finally destroy himself and cease to exists! But why combat positions that are not in my premises? Who ever took the ground that God could destroy one of his attributes? But I do say that God has power to limit the exercise of his attributes; if not, then the whole Bible is an enigma! Cannot God limit the exercise of his power? If not, then he must do every thing that ever has been, is, or ever will be done to all eternity. He must on this principle, be guilty of all the abominations he has condemned in his word. My friend refused to indorse these absurdities at the commencement of this debate, and confessed that he had seen them years ago; yet he seems still anxious to get back into the very same absurd assumption that makes God the author of sin. But suppose God cannot limit the exercise of any of his attributes; then it follows that he must *love* sin, the devil, and every thing that is hateful and wicked! Now since God can limit the exercise of some of his attributes, as must be admitted, he can, on the same principle, limit the exercise of any of them, or else some of the attributes of an infinite God are inferior to others. As this will not be assumed by any one, my position is therefore fairly made out, that God could consistently limit the exercise of his knowledge. This is sufficient for that objection.

Now since our view of the subject does not lead to Atheism, permit me to ask what is the result of my opponent's doctrine? If it do not lead to Atheism it leads to fatality, and that, too, of the very worst kind. It makes God himself a subject of fate, which is no better than to deny his existence. It not only binds man to an unalterable destiny, irrevocably marked out millions of ages before Adam was created, by postulating the immutable foreknowledge of God which knows no disappointment and makes such foreknowledge the same as forordination; but it also chains down the Almighty Jehovah with the fetters of foreknowing every event, and thus giving him a *certain amount* of knowledge, which he can neither add to nor di-

minish from: in fact, it binds all his other attributes to the same point of unchangeable necessity; and thus we have the Father of spirits deprived of volition, and every thing like freedom of thought and action, hand-cuffed perfectly by this overruling system of super-Almighty fatalism!

5. Another objection, which my friend urges against my position, is that God is *Allwise*, and must necessarily foreknow from all eternity every thing that cometh to pass. But this does not follow any more than because God is *Almighty*, he must therefore *do* every thing that ever is done, which we have shown to be preposterous. The idea of *Almighty* is, that God can do what he pleases and therefore what is *doable* consistent with his moral government; and, on the same principle, the fact of his being *Allwise*, is, that he can *know* what he pleases and what is *knowable*, consistent with his other attributes. This makes his attributes equal, the way every consistent person is compelled to view the subject.

6. In the sixth place, my friend objects to the view I have taken of the foreknowledge of God, because the scriptures teach that "God from all eternity foreknew whatsoever cometh to pass." But my friend ought to know that there is no such text in the Bible, although I have heard it often quoted. There are texts, however, which speak of a very extensive foreknowledge, I admit, but not one which covers the whole ground taken by my opponent. For example: "I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the *end* from the *beginning*." If this signifies foreknowledge, then let *me* ask: did he know the *end* of sin, before it had a "*beginning*?" If not, then he did not know it from all eternity! If it was from "*ancient times*," as the text declares, then it was not from all eternity, for my friend would not, I think, argue that there were "*times*" in eternity before *time* had a beginning! Again: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Why say, "from the *beginning* of the *world*," if it was from all eternity? The word *world* here is not *cosmos* in the Greek, but *aionos*, signifying an age, or dispensation. Neither does the text, "All things are naked and opened to the eyes of him with whom we have to do," help the objection of my opponent. Look at the language: "All things *are* naked and opened," in the present tense, not *were* naked and opened from all eternity Mark this. There is no other text more to the point than those my friend brought forward: yet they come not within a thousand miles of disposing of my argument.

7. His next objection is, that God must have foreknown before he made man that he would sin, from the fact that he ordained Christ to be a Saviour, "before the *foundation of the world*." I admit the word *world* in this case to be *cosmos*, referring to the literal earth which we now inhabit. But I cannot believe that God would ordain Christ to save man from sin before he was created; for upon this principle, as my friend has already urged, he must have decreed

that man should commit sin, in order that Christ might perform the work for which God had ordained him. I had always thought that a Saviour was prepared for sin; but according to this view the Saviour was first, and then sin was prepared for the Saviour, so that he should have something to do in his office of deliverer from sin.

"God must have foreordained that mankind should sin,
That Christ might perform what was ordained for him;
As Christ *was* ordained and his work he *must* do:
Then mankind *must* sin to carry it through!"

This is the puzzling point. If God foreordained that Christ should save man from sin and then went to work and made man with the certainty that he must sin (as the decree concerning Christ could not be broken), it follows inevitably that God designed, in the creation of man, that he should sin, just as much as he designed that Christ should save him from it! This conclusion cannot be avoided upon the ground of my opponent; and for this reason I do not at all believe that God ordained Christ to be a Saviour before he created man! But here the question comes up, how to dispose of the testimony of Peter, that Christ was ordained before the foundation of the world, since we admit the word *world* to signify the literal earth? We shall let the Apostle Peter settle the question; but in the first place we ask: Was there not a literal earth existing before the one which we now inhabit? He answers: "For this they are willingly ignorant of, that by the word of God, the heavens were of old, and the *earth* standing out of the water and in the water, whereby the *world* (*cosmos*) that *then* was being overflowed with water *perished;* but the havens and the *earth* which *are now*, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and the perdition of ungodly men." [2 Pet. 3. 5. 6] This testimony is pointed, that the *world* or *cosmos* which existed before the flood, being overflowed with water *perished* or was *destroyed;* and that since then there has existed another earth. Hence the apostle keeps up the contrast between the *cosmos* or *earth* that *then was* and the *earth* which is *now*, proving that the earth which *is now* is not the earth which existed before the flood! I know it is objected, that the earth was not destroyed,—that it was only the people. But I object to this objection for two reasons: 1. If the earth was not destroyed in the flood, then there is no sense nor propriety in the contrast kept up by the apostle between the *earth* that *then was* and the *earth* that *is now*, one being literally deluged in water, and the other destined to be as literally deluged in fire: and 2. The Bible teaches positively that the earth was destroyed. "And behold," saith God, "I will *destroy* them with the *earth.*" [Gen. 6. 13.] "And I will establish my covenant with you, neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood, neither shall there be any more a *flood to destroy the earth.*" [Gen. 9. 11.] What this destruction of

the earth was, is not for me to say; neither do I take the ground that the materials of which the earth was composed were destroyed; yet the earth itself was destroyed in some very important sense, for so the Bible explicitly affirms. Suffice it to say, that some transformation or disorganization of the earth took place in that cataclysm, which justified the inspired writers in designating it by the term *destruction!* Having thus premised, we draw the following irresistible conclusion, that the foreordination of Christ "before the foundation of the world" was sometime before the flood, in the antedeluvian age, after sin was introduced! This is my conviction upon this subject, neither do I blieve it can be refuted. I do not see how men can believe with my opponent and keep out of fatalism. If they can, they possess powers to which I am, and always expect to be, a stranger.

8. Again: he objects to my application of the text from Jeremiah. "Which I commanded them not neither came it into my heart," that is, according to my opponent's objection, neither came it into my heart to command it! But this will never do. The grammatical construction of the language forbids it. Mark the phraseology: "*Which* I commanded them not." What? Ans: the burning of their sons and daughters in the fire. "Neither came *it*," i. e., the very thing which I commanded them not, namely, the burning of their sons and daughters in the fire; "neither came *it* into my heart." The relative *which* refers to the *act* of burning their sons and daughters in the fire; and the pronoun *it*, personates the same thing. The Lord says in another place: "They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, *which* I commanded them not, nor spake *it*, neither came *it* into my mind." [Jer. 19. 5] "*Which* I commanded them not," namely, the *act* of burning their sons in the fire: "Nor spake *it*,"—the thing, of course, *which* I commanded them not: "Neither came *it*,"—the same *it*, and the same *which* I commanded them not: "nor spake *it*, neither came *it* into my mind;" that is, it never came into my mind that they would be guilty of burning their sons in the fire as burnt offerings unto Baal! This is most unquestionably the true and obvious idea of the text, as every grammarian must see.

9. We come now to the examination of his last objection, which is, that *grieving*, and *repenting*, and all such expressions when applied to God, do not have the same meaning, nor convey the same idea as when applied to men; that they are used in an accommodated sense. This appears to be his last struggle. Well we shall see. An accommodated sense! Who does it accommodate? Not God, certainly, for he needs no accommodation of that kind; and more than this the revelation was not made to him but to us. Hence the language must be accommodated to us if accommodated at all. Now if the language be accommodated to us, then it must convey to us the same idea that we generally attach to such language or it

is no accommodation! So much to accommodate this very accommodating objection.

But if *grieving* and *repenting*, because applied to God, are to be understood as signifying something entirely different from what they do when applied to man; then how ought we to understand the text (if we could find it,) "God foreknew from all eternity whatsoever cometh to pass?" We must not understand it to signify what it says, but give it my friend's accommodated meaning, which is, to make it signify the exact opposite of what it says! We could thus prove that God did not know from all eternity any thing that cometh to pass! One text with respect to God's foreknowledge should be just as accommodating as another! Again: If the *grief* and *repentance* of God be entirely different from the *grief and repentance* of man, then I contend that when the Bible says: "God is *good* unto all," the word *good* is to be understood in an accommodated sense, as signifying something altogether different from its common acceptation. Hence we can draw no definite conclusion from the *goodness* of God as to the destiny of man for we know not what it signifies since it must be accommodated to the logic of my opponent! As all such words, when applied to God cannot mean what they do when applied to man, we cannot tell but that the *goodness* and *mercy* of God will damn the whole human family rather than save them! I might admit with all safety the logic of my friend, and challenge him to prove the salvation of any body from the attributes of God; for all language, when applied to God, he tells us, is to be understood in an accommodated sense, and consequently out of its common signification. Thus his objection breaks down by inherent self-destruction.

[Alpha here interrupted the speaker, and said:] I wish gentlemen moderators, to correct a mistake into which my friend has fallen. I do not claim that language, when applied to God, is to be understood as meaning the reverse of what it says, the way my opponent represents me: but I understand it to be used in an infinitely gr ater sense than when applied to man. For example: when we read that God *loves* all men, I understand his love, not as different from ours, but being exercised in an infinitely greater degree.

[Omega proceeds.]

Very good: I am glad my friend explained himself; for we can now understand the text which says: God *repented* that he had made man and it *grieved* him at the heart. It is not to be understood as different from the *grief* and *repentance* of man, but simply that his *grief* and *repentance* was infinitely greater, or more intense! Now if the sins of men caused *infinite grief*, then they are infinite offences, and consequently deserve infinite punishment! I hope my friend will explain again.

One of two positions must be taken here, either of which plucks *up the doctrine of* my opponent by the roots. We are compelled to

assume either that the foregoing expressions, such as *knowing, loving, grieving, repenting,* &c., mean the same in nature when applied to God that they do when applied to man, or that they do not. If they do, then my position is clearly made out, that God did not foreknow from all eternity whatsoever cometh to pass, since this, as I have shown, the Bible repeatedly affirms. But if we assume that they do not mean the same, that they do when applied to man, then we cannot tell what they do mean; and consequently as all such matters, connected with God, are incomprehensible, we cannot therefore draw any definite conclusion in favor of universal salvation from what the Bible teaches concerning God; neither can we present any rational argument against the doctrine that God may have power to limit his knowledge, since we know not what the word *knowledge* or *power* signifies when applied to him!

But my friend appeals to the sympathies of his audience. Such *ad captandum* logic is generally resorted to and found more successful in advocating the doctrine of my opponent than any testimony that can be adduced from the word of God. He has given us an awful representation of endless misery! He speaks of "ceaseless torture,"—"irretrievable ruin,"—"endless torment,"—"interminable woe," &c., &c., in order to horrify the audience at the idea;—just as if that were any argument in favor of universal salvation. But I have three or four considerations to present relative to this matter: and in the first place, I would inform my opponent and all persons present, that I have not come here to advocate "endless misery," or any other affirmative; but simply to oppose Univeralism. Hence I am not bound to defend "ceaseless torture," but my business is to show this audience that the arguments of my opponent do not prove universal salvation! This I conceive to have been effectually done from the commencement of this discussion.

But my friend appears to think, that should he succeed in overthrowing "endless misery," it proves universal salvation! This, however, does not follow as the only alternative, by any means. There can be as plausible arguments adduced (and more of them) in favor of the position that the wicked will never be raised from the dead, as can be presented in favor of Universalism. Paul labored, as he declared, "If by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." [Phil. 3. 11.] The Saviour speaks of those "who shall be accounted worthy to obtain—the resurrection of the dead." [Luke 20. 35.]—From this testimeny it might be plausibly argued, with all the ingenuity of Universalism, that the wicked would not have part in the resurrection, because they did not labor to obtain it, and hence, they would neither be saved nor suffer "endless misery." But I take no such position.

Again: It might be argued, and Universalists, according to their own doctrine, can be compelled to admit its force, that the wicked will be raised from the dead, and utterly destroyed or an-

nihilated! Paul says concerning them: "Whose *end* is destruction." [Ph. 3. 19.] It might be asked: How can their *end* be destruction unless they come to an *end*? And how can they come to an *end* unless they are annihilated, or unless they "*utterly perish*," as says the Apostle Peter; or how can they *live* after they die "*the second death.*" [Rev. 21. 8.] How, it might be asked, can the punishment of the wicked be compared to the burning up of "*chaff*,"—"*tares*,"—"*dry branches*,"—"*hay, wood, stubble*,"—"*thorns and briers*,"—and they be always burning, and never burn up?—[Math. 3. 12; 13. 40. John 15. 6. 1 Cor. 3. 15. Heb. 6.8.] Would there be any similarity between endless misery and the burning up of *chaff*? Universalists contend that the destruction of *death* and the *devil* signifies their utter annihilation!—that *death* and the *devil* will no longer *exist* after Christ destroys them! Now as the same *being* is to destroy the wicked who is to destroy death and the devil; and as they are to be destroyed at the same time and in the same place,—"the lake of fire and brimstone," [Rev. 20,] will it not be the same destruction; and, according to Universalism will not wicked men as well as *death* and the *devil* be *annihilated*? This would disprove universal salvation, and would not be "ceaseless torment." But Universalists will tell us, that the destruction of the wicked is simply their destruction as such, that is, the destruction of their sins! But stop: whatever is *destroyed* is *punished*. "Who shall be *punished* with everlasting *destruction*." [2 Thes. 1. 9.] Is it the *man* who is punished, or his *sins*? The *man* certainly: and hence my opponent is compelled, according to his own criticism, to admit that it is the man who is to be annihilated if destruction means annihilation. Thus he is completely driven, by his own arguments, out of Universalism, and if he can't endure the horrifying doctrine of "endless torment," he can just step over into "*destructionism*," and have a much more consistent theory to content for than the one he is now advocating, though he would still be in error.

But in the last place, I will take a position and prove it too by the very logic of my opponent, that the wicked can suffer *endless torment*, and *rejoice* all the while! This being proved, away goes all this pathetic slopping-over about "ceaseless torture,"—"vindictive hatred,"—"inexorable cruelty," etc., etc. Let us try it. My opponent has taken the position, and argued it strongly since this debate commenced that all men are punished in this life all that their sins deserve, and that they are punished every day as long as they continue to sin, and that to this punishment apply all the fearful threats of the scriptures. Very good: let us now look at what the Bible says concerning the wicked who, according to Universalism, were at the same time suffering the "everlasting punishment" threatened by the Saviour. We are informed that they "*have pleasure in unrighteousness*,"—that they "*enjoy the pleasures of sin*,"—that they "*count it pleasure to riot* in the day-time,—*sporting themselves with*

*their own deceivings*,"—that they "*delight in lies*,"—that "*their souls delight in their abominations*,"—and that they "*rejoice to do evil!*" [2 Thess. 2. 12. Heb. 11. 25. 2 Pet. 2. 13. Ps. 62. 4. Is. 66. 3. Prov. 2. 14.] These sinners, let it be remembered, are all this while suffering punishment for their sins! Yes, according to Universalism, they are now enduring the awful judgment threatened by Christ and the apostles,—the damnation of hell; and all the while too they have *pleasure*, they *sport*, they *rejoice to do evil*, and *delight in lies and abominations!* A man is always the best judge as regards himself, whether he is *happy* or *miserable*. Now suppose you offer a helping hand to one of those conscience-seared rioters who is now *delighting* in his *lies* and *abominations*, and *sporting* and *rejoicing* in the *pleasures of unrighteousness*, and he will tell you he wants no better times, and no better company than he is now enjoying. If you wish to make him miserable, let him think he will be compelled to go to heaven; but if you wish to make his heart leap for joy, convince him from the Bible that he is now in the very hottest hell there is, and that he will have to remain in this Universalian "lake of fire" to all eternity, and your object is attained. Such fellows would hardly thank my opponent for preaching against such a hell as that! It is a great consolation to them, however, when they hear a talented Universalist combating the hell of orthodoxy! As one of them once told a preacher (when he saw he was about to break down upon the text: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment,") "Make it out if you can, Mr. T.—if you don't, I'm a gone sucker!"

Now permit me to ask my friend, and all Universalists present, whether it would be "soul-benumbing," or "heart-withering," to think that such profligate characters are doomed to suffer "endless punishment" or "ceaseless torture," when they are now in the very hottest of it, according to their own doctrine, and "*enjoy*" it so well that the highest and strongest motives of heaven and earth cannot induce them to leave it? Does it "*benumb*" your *soul*, my dear sir, to think that they *enjoy* themselves so well now, and that they will continue to be tormented with such delightful punishment as will make them "*rejoice to do evil*" to all eternity? Singular logic indeed, to be horrified at the idea of a sinner remaining eternally in a condition which, if he could be induced to pray at all, would be his first and most fervent request! And would it be "vindictive hatred," and "inexorable cruelty," on the part of God if he should confer upon the sinner that which he desired above all things in heaven and earth? All we insist upon is the punishment of the Bible; and as the sinner is now suffering that very punishment, according to Universalism, and *rejoicing* in it at the same time, why should my opponent object, and why should he make such an ado because he is destined thus to "*enjoy the pleasures of sin*" to all eternity?

But he tries to tell us how long eternity is, and I confess he gets

about as far into it, as I have ever seen any one go; yet it is no objection to an endless misery as has just been demonstrated. But Universalists may be deceived, as regards the punishment of sinners here in time, and my opponent can but have serious doubts I am confident, with reference to all men being saved in heaven. Now as heaven is a most glorious and desirable place, and if a man lose heaven he loses all, and as my opponent must admit that he may be wrong and that there is at least a risk in preaching Universalism of the loss of heaven both to himself and others, hence, the *length* of eternity is against him and not against us! Let him think of the joys of *endless felicity* which he is jeopardizing for himself and others every time he preaches the at least doubtful doctrine of Universalism! Suppose we could enjoy a little more present happiness if we all believed in Universalism, than we now do (which is exceedingly doubtful), then compare this paltry difference with the illimitable and inconceivable contrast between this short life and boundless—shoreless e-t-e-r-n-i-t-y, and it follows, if there be but one probability in a *million* against Universalism, it rationally forbids any man to preach the doctrine? But how much greater is the hazard in preaching Universalism when there is not one probability in a million in its favor?

I remember the poetry he quoted, and let that give him an idea of how much he risks every time he preaches his doctrine! He enumerated all the blades of grass,—grains of sand,—drops of water,—rays of light,—stars of heaven, and leaves, buds, and blossoms of the forest, and even yet he had entered but the portals of eternity? Let us if possible try to look still further. Suppose all this countless number to be multiplied into itself as many times as it contains units, and this whole amount set down in as many different places as there are atoms of matter in the universe.

Then estimate this sum without delay,
And mark the ages that have pass'd away:
Then set this number down *ten thousand* times,
Make each of these to head *ten thousand* lines:
Let every line *ten thousand* miles extend,
Make numbers in the lines so closely blend
That microscope can not discern between,
Nor mark the distance that shall intervene:
Then strike a line below, and add again;
And take the mighty sum you thus obtain;
Let every unite stand for ages vast,
And wait until those ages long have past:
And should you wait as many millions more,
Duration must continue as before!
There's none but God can solve this mystery—
This wonderous problem of *eternity!*

Thus we see how much my friend is hazarding whenever he preaches Universalism based as it is, and as he must see, upon a most uncertain foundation! Let it be remembered, then, that whenever a Universalist minister attempts to portray the length of eternity, it is against himself and no objection to "*endless misery;*" since every Universalist is compelled to admit that men may be *endlessly punished* and *rejoice* all the while! I hope this will satisfy my friend and that we shall henceforth hear no more about the cruelty of the orthodox faith in "endless misery" and "ceaseless torment!"

I have already continued my speech longer than I had intended; but I felt it my duty to say something in reply to the concluding part of my friend's address, from the consideration that such sympathetic and self-contradictory appeals are generally resorted to as a valuable substitute for Bible testimony, and as a bait with which to catch the vulgar.

I hope you will ponder well the things you have heard, and reflect seriously upon the dangers of embracing any theological doctrine except the one formulated by Solomon: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man; for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." [Ec. 12. 13, 14.] May the Lord keep us from the snares and devices of the adversary, and preserve us blameless unto his heavenly kingdom.

## CHAPTER X.

### A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE PRO AND CON.

*"Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."*—Matt. 15. 18.

The *Pro and Con of Universalism*, by the Rev. George Rogers, is undoubtedly the strongest work ever written in defense of that doctrine, while its author is admitted to possess a greater amount of caution and foresight than any other advocate of the Universalist faith, living or dead. I state these facts that the reader may see (when the absurdities and blunders which the author has perpetrated are exposed before him) that the system is radically defective in itself—that it is manifestly *false*, or so many and such palpable self-contradictions could not have occurred in so small a work (356 pages) and under the watchful eye of so wise and prudent an author.

I purpose in the following strictures to study brevity, and give only samples enough from the work under review to satisfy the intelligent reader that the cause of Universalism is not founded in truth, and that it carries its own refutation engraven upon its very front. So far as the author of the work under review has relied on scriptural testimony in support of his theological views, the book, needs no examination here, as all such matters have been fully canvassed in the foregoing pages of this work. We shall therefore proceed immediately to point out some of the *difficulties*, *absurdities*, and *self-contradictions* in which the author of the *Pro and Con* has involved himself, in his infatuated endeavors to sustain the *absurd* doctrine of Universalism.

He contends, as the first point to be noticed, that God is the author of sin.

"Believe me, reader, it is not possible to avoid the conclusion that *all events* take place agreeably to the *unalterable decrees of Jehovah*."—Page 300.

"The scriptures are most satisfactory, most philosophical upon this puzzling point, [the origin of sin;] they teach that 'of God are all things,'—they represent Jehovah himself as saying, 'I *form* the light and *create* darkness, I *make* peace and *create evil*, I the Lord do all these things.' "—p. 81.

"'So! then,' exclaims the Arminian objector, 'the author really seems bent on proving that as Jehovah foreknew the existence of sin, he must also have *designed* it!' Yes, such is really my purpose."—p. 286.

"Having then, as I think, established the conclusion that absolute foreknowledge implies absolute foreordination, I proceed to notice the objections which seem to lie *against it. I have already* considered the most formidable of these, viz., that it makes

God the author of sin; and I now ask, how, on any ground, is this to be avoided? I assert moreover that it is plainly scriptural."—p. 287.

These extracts will suffice upon this point for the present. He here asserts, not only that God is "the author of sin," but he quotes and misapplies scripture to prove that he *made* and *created* it just as he created "*light.*" Bear this in mind and observe how it corresponds with the following:

"But in accommodation to our limited conceptions the retributive dispensations of his providence are termed his anger, because they display the *repugnance* of his *infinitely pure nature to all unholiness.*"—p. 121.

"If sin shall always exist, it will be owing either to a want of power in God to destroy it, or to a want of disposition. To the former it cannot be, for he is Almighty; neither can it be to the latter, for it is a *thousand times* declared in his word, in one form or other, that *sin is utterly odious to him.*"—p. 61.

Then, sir, it is a "*thousand times* declared in his word that" Universalism is false; for how can God be the *author* of a thing and form it by the creative act, as he formed *light*, and that thing be "*utterly odious to him?*" How can he be the author of all the wickedness in existence, and yet possess an "infinitely pure nature?" If God can be thus *pure*, and at the same time be the direct author or *creator* of sin, then there is no danger of any man becoming *impure* by practicing it! And if one thing that God has created be "utterly odious to him," may not all his other works be equally repugnant to his infinitely pure nature? And if God will utterly destroy or annihilate one part of his *creation* (which the *Pro and Con* asserts concerning sin) and that part too which was designed for a good end, where is the proof that he will not utterly destroy any other or all other parts of his creation; and especially the human family, which the *Pro and Con* asserts were designed like sin for "*some future purpose of goodness?*" [p. 103.] But if God is the author of all *wrong*, then we cannot reasonably expect him to do that which is right at any future period, for he is without variableness or shadow of turning. This author asserts the same.

"Convince me that my maker can do what is *wrong*, or omit to do what is *right* at one time, and I shall at once despair of his doing otherwise at any time!"—p. 200.

Now the *Pro and Con* is necessarilly compelled to admit that God will continue to decree sin, and thus do what is *wrong* to all eternity, or else he must deny that there is any thing *wrong* in the universe; for he has repeatedly affirmed (as before quoted,) that God is the author and creator of all things universally including sin! If an evasion be attempted here by assuming that God created sin only as a temporary *wrong*, to be overruled for a good end, still it leaves the difficulty as bad as ever; for we may expect him to do the same thing at any other, and at all other times, and thus he may continue to create sin and misery to all eternity for a good end? How will they ever be destroyed, according to this? Finally: if sin originated, or had its well-spring in the eternal God, as the Pro and Con teaches,

then it will be absolutely eternal in its duration, for the author asserts that

"Moreover life must be *absolutely eternal*, having its well-spring in the eternal God."—p. 187.

So much for this monstrously absurd doctrine that God is the author of sin. But this is not the worst of it. The doctrine inculcated in the work under examination must, if believed, necessarily and inevitably encourage men to commit sin. This I will now prove. In the first place it is most reasonable to suppose that sin cannot be a very dangerous thing, since God went to the pains of foreordaining it for a good purpose; but viewing it as the *Pro and Con* does, it is far preferable to virtue or holiness,—salutary and glorious in its result, and must necessarily prompt every rational man to have as much of the commodity on hand as possible. Reader, this is no fiction; if you suspect it such, read the following:

"That God has no pleasure in sin for its own sake is clear, for it is opposed to his nature—but that God does will its existence for the present, and with reference to *some future purpose of goodness*, it were the essence of folly to deny, for otherwise it would not be."—p. 108.

"Love can approve of all things as they are, because it looks forward to what they are to be; it can approve of present evil with a view to *future* and *greater good*; it can smile upon a short night of *tears*, which is to issue in an ever-enduring day of joy, the *brighter for those tears!*"—p. 126.

"Of all people on earth, we have the least reason for being dissatisfied with the present life; for according to our view, all its sorrows, temptations, trials, disappointments, &c., are appointed by infinite love, to exercise us here *for our hereafter advantage*."—p. 151.

"Truth is, our Creator has designed that this existence should be one of partial suffering—moral as well as physical suffering; and in appointing the end he has also appointed the means. *Sin* is the *main means* by which the former is brought on. All this, I know, would reflect no glory upon the Creator's character, but for the fact—the glorious heart-cheering fact, that out of all this shall issue an universally benevolent result: 'our light afflictions,' [sin and its consequent misery,] 'which are but for a moment, worketh for us *a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*.'"—p. 297.

"The tiger is loose, (by which I would personate sin and misery,) whether by appointment or permission you must see that the divine character is equally concerned in the event. Shall it roam and make havoc amongst God's offspring forever? or shall it be destroyed—the wounds it has inflicted be healed, and the subjects of its violence be brought to see and experience that, all things considered, *it was better* for them to have suffered from its fury for a time, *that thereby their happiness might be enhanced for eternity*."—p. 312.

Here you have it, reader; not only that sin was designed for a good end, but that it will "*enhance our happiness for eternity!*" Who, then, would not desire as much sin as possible, seeing it is "*for our hereafter advantage*," and will result in "*greater good*," than we could have experienced without its "*means?*" But the *Pro and Con* tries to avoid this difficulty.

"He who sins most, has most moral suffering: God has joined these two things together, and no man can put them asunder. The reader will therefore learn not to plead this doctrine as an excuse for sinning the more, for, so sure as he does so, *he must suffer the more*."—p. 297.

If I believed "this doctrine," I should not only plead it "as an excuse for sinning the more," but I should feel it my imperative duty, as I loved myself, and desired happiness, to embrace every opportunity of practicing wickedness: and if it should cause me to shed *tears* of sorrow and regret, I would rejoice in such suffering, knowing that it would ultimately "*issue in an ever-enduring day of joy, the brighter for those tears.*" Why should not I desire to commit sin, since thereby my "*happiness* would be *enhanced* for *eternity*?" and why should I not desire and earnestly crave the "*moral sufferings*" which will result from sin, since the *Pro and Con* has given us the assurance that this *light affliction* which is but for a moment, will work out for us "*a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*?" Thus, if the doctrine of the *Pro and Con* be true, we have *infinite motives* held out before us as inducements to practice sin rather than holiness. But as sin is "utterly odious to God" and nevertheless will *enhance* our *happiness* for *eternity* it follows that this eternal happiness, the result of sin, must also be "*utterly odious*" to him, as the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain, and the effect cannot exceed the cause that produced it. Hence, as sin will be destroyed, this eternal happiness, which so admirably resulted from sin as the "means," ought to go along with it! But, according to the *Pro and Con*, sin ought of necessity to continue to all eternity, in order to keep up this eternal happiness! See the following:

"The soul (by which I mean the moral nature) is so constituted, that none of the affections thereof can be exercised forever, without a *perpetual action of the exciting cause.* They may be compared to fires, which will burn out in time *except new fuel be added:* or to springs whose waters will exhaust, *except kept up by constant new supplies.* Take, for instance, the affection of *joy;* you know, that to however rapturous a degree it may be excited, it will *subside at length*, unless it be *renewed by fresh objects.*"—pp. 252-3.

Now as sin is to enhance our happiness for eternity, it is most evident that sin itself must necessarily endure to eternity; for the affection of *joy* or *happiness*, so beautifully enhanced by sin, "will subside at length unless *renewed by fresh objects.*" It will go out, like fire, "*except new fuel be added;*" or this happiness which is the result of sin and misery, like springs of water, will exhaust itself "except kept up by *constant new supplies*," or by "a *perpetual action of the exciting cause.*" If this does not prove that sin and misery must endure eternally, off and on, as we sometimes say, then nothing can be made apparent by the English language. Once more upon this point

"To the first question, I reply, that sin, though odious in itself, may yet, as overruled by the divine Being, be made to eventuate in a *greater good* than could be effected *without its means.* I say not that God appointed it *to that end;* but that he will so overrule it that such will be the result. How otherwise can his permitting its existence be vindicated?"—p. 62.

After stating that sin will "be made to eventuate in a greater good

than could be effected without its *means*," he makes this declaration which I wish the reader particularly to notice: "I say not that God *appointed it to that end.*" Now one of two things must follow inevitably, since God did not appoint sin to a *good end*, either he did not *appoint* it at all, or he appointed it to a bad end and got disappointed in the result! If the *Pro and Con* meant that God did not *appoint* sin at all, but simply *permitted* it (which is quite evident from his language), then he contradicts himself most pointedly. In replying to the Armenian objection, that Universalism makes God the author of sin, he remarks:

"We make him the author of all things, indeed;—it can make no actual difference between us in this respect, that you say God *permits*, while *we say he appoints*, for the result is the same in both cases."—pp. 311-12.

Here he gives us his real views (I presume), that God did actually *appoint* sin, but as he did not appoint it to a *good* end, he must therefore have *appointed* it to a *bad* end, and thus God is not only disappointed in having sin result in good when he appointed it for the opposite, but he is proved to be a cruel tyrant; for if he created and appointed one thing to a bad end, we cannot infer, with any degree of propriety but that he created all other things with the same design. But again: According to the argument of the *Pro and Con* it is perfectly *reasonable* and consistent for sin and misery to exist in the eternal state of being. This I will prove.

"I believe that this view obtains very generally amongst the Unitarians of this country, and the author will confess it is that to which his own judgment the most strongly inclines. The only objection (so far as I know) to which it is liable, is, that it represents Jehovah as *partial*, in making some of his creatures to be *eternally superior to others*. But then it is admitted that some are actually made superior to others *in time*—superior in person, intellect, *fortune*—and moral qualities. Why not these facts as well form a ground of impeachment against the impartiality of God as the other?"—p. 334.

Sure enough! The *Pro and Con*, after all his philosophizing upon the unreasonableness of sin or punishment existing in eternity, now comes out and proves that some men will "be eternally superior to others," from the fact that they are so here in time! and that it will not impeach the character of God for the same distinctions to exist between men in eternity that exist here in time! Truly this is a new way of defending Universalism. But hear him again:

"It is against *reason*, because from what is *possible* to us in our *present mode of being*, it is *unreasonable* and *presumptuous* to infer with confidence, as to what is, or is not possible to *every conceivable mode of being*."—p. 343.

Hence it is *possible* and *reasonable* for men to be sinful and miserable in the eternal state of being, as much so as here, and to all eternity for that matter; and the *Pro and Con* has demonstrated himself to be one of the most "unreasonable and presumptuous" men on earth, because he has, in a number of cases, inferred most positively and dogmatically, that it was not reasonable nor possible for sin and

misery to exist in the future state! But here he kills his doctrine at a single blow, by admitting that it is reasonable and possible for sin and misery to exist in the future state, from the fact that they exist here. Once more:

"We here experience that *effort* is the price of all *attainment*, both *moral* and *intellectual*—that all *advancement*, as well as *retrogression*, is *progressive*. These things we know to be the case *at present*, and we have no *reason* for supposing that they will be *different with us*, when we enter upon a *new stage of existence!*"—p. 346.

Yes, "all *advancement*, as well as *retrogression*, is *progressive*." Look at this sentence. Some men *advance* in virtuous improvement as long as they live, becoming better and better till they die, whilst "evil men and seducers wax *worse* and *worse*," or *progress* in retrogradation. This is true: and as "we have no reason for supposing it will be different with us, when we enter upon a new stage of existence," it follows that the retrogression of the wicked will be progressive eternally;—they will continue to "wax worse and worse," whilst the righteous will continue to advance in moral and spiritual improvement forever and ever. How, then, will the *Pro and Con* get the wicked saved after death if they continue in the future state in their *retrograde progression?* Again:

"Nevertheless, as 'one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the *resurrection of the dead*.' It seems anything but *reasonable* to suppose that there will be no difference at that era, betwixt Paul, (for example,) and the individual who passed from time without having taken the first step in *moral advancement*."—p. 346.

Thus we discover that there will be the same difference between men at the resurrection, in point of "*moral advancement*" that there is now! Then it follows, as some men are entirely destitute of moral principle or quality here, that they will be destitute of it there, or in other words, they will be just as destitute of holiness in the resurrection as they are here in time! They will, therefore, be raised unholy, and consequently in their sins! But again:

"Our souls (like gardens in nature) *cannot* be got into a condition of yielding the fruits of the Spirit in any great degree of excellency or abundance without *sedulous* and *persevering cultivation*."—p. 346.

Then of course, since some men will continue in the future state to progress in wickedness, as we have seen, it follows that *their souls* will never yield the fruits of the Spirit; for it is quite evident, if they continue to "wax worse and worse" in eternity, as they do here in time (which the *Pro and Con* asserts), that their souls will never come under the influence of very "*sedulous and persevering cultivation*."

But according to his views of the immutability of God, it must necessarily follow that God will punish some men to all eternity. Reader, mark if this be not so.

"The *mutability* of God is manifestly implied in the common supposition, that although he will bear with the provocations of sinners during the term of their stay on earth, yet so soon as they are removed hence he will utterly alter his course, and let loose his vengeance upon them without mercy."—p. 55.

Now observe that according to this argument, it makes out God a *mutable* or *changeable* being if he should do one thing with a sinner in *time*, and do differently with him in eternity! This makes God changeable! Yes; and hence, according to the *Pro and Con*, God is unchangeable and consequently will continue to do with sinners in eternity whatever he does in time. This is his argument without exaggeration. Now does it not follow that God will continue to punish wicked men eternally, since, according to Universalism, he punishes them as long as they live on earth, and he is unchangeable! Thus the *Pro and Con* is compelled to admit, according to his own logic, that the wicked will endure endless punishment as certain as God is immutable.

We shall now examine his views on punishment.

"Punishment is of two kinds as to its nature,—several, as to its objects. One kind may be termed *arbitrary*,—the other *necessary*. *Arbitrary* punishment is such as results from the *mere will of the punisher;* it has *no natural connection with the offense*. *Necessary* punishment is such as necessarily proceeds from the sin itself; it is an unavoidable consequence of it. In the one, an *outward executioner* is required; in the other, *sin is its own executioner*. The stroke of the one may therefore be dodged; the stroke of the other is as inevitable as fate. Hence it will be seen, that between murder and hanging there is no *natural connection*. The connection is *arbitrary*, hence its *uncertainty*. Now let us see whether *divine punishment* can be thus *evaded*."—pp. 242-3.

We *will* "*see*," sir, and will prove by *yourself*, that everything you have said in this connection against "*arbitrary* punishment," as you define it, casts most impious reflections upon the character and government of God! I say it will be proved by *yourself!* Reader, before proceeding, please turn back, and read this last quotation again, and mark particularly those words in *italics*.—You will discover that "*arbitrary* punishment" is the opposite of "*necessary*" and consequently *unnecessary*. Then observe that "arbitrary punishment" "has *no natural connection with the offense*,"—"results from the mere will of the punisher," and needs "*an outward executioner*." Hence he concludes that "*hanging*," or any other punishment which needs "an outward executioner" is *arbitrary, unnecessary*, and having "no natural connection with the offense"! But has not God, in numerous instances, inflicted *arbitrary* punishment? Most certainly. Was not the fire and brimstone which were poured down upon the Sodomites "arbitrary punishment," and did it not require "an *outward executioner*?" Was not the flood upon the antediluvians?—the Red Sea upon the Egyptians?—the sword of Joshua upon the Canaanites, and the Roman soldiers upon Jerusalem? Were not these *outward executioners?* The man who was pelted with stones, for breaking the sabbath, by the express directions of the Almighty,—who "*died without mercy* under two or three witnesses," had he not an outward executioner? What say you reader? If these things were so, were they not "*arbitrary* punishments" according to the *Pro and Con? But I said I would* prove it from *himself*, and here it is!

"I do not affirm that in the administration of the divine government *arbitrary punishments* have never occurred; in scripture times it would seem, the divine dealings with men were more direct and visible than they have since been. In those days, *outward* and *sensible expressions of his displeasure* against sin sometimes occurred; as in the deluge, the destruction of Sodom, Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, and Jerusalem."—p. 245.

Here, then, we have it, that God has, on various occasions, inflicted "*arbitrary punishment*" and hence has inflicted such punishment as is not necessary, and which "has no natural connection with the offense!" Now as God has inflicted arbitrary and *unnecessary* punishment (according to this author), upon some of the transgressors of his law, will he not, if he be impartial and immutable, inflict similar punishment upon all transgressors? The *Pro and Con* shall answer:

"Now it is absolutely pitiful, yea, contemptible, to give to passages of this nature a *partial* application, as if Jehovah does not in his dealings with *each* and *all of the transgressors of his law, observe the same eternal principles of mercy and justice.*"—p. 247.

May I not add, that "it is absolutely pitiful, yea, contemptible," for the *Pro and Con* to argue has he does:—first ridicule the idea of "arbitrary punishment," as being calculated to encourage crime; in the second place acknowledge that God had adopted this very ridiculous scheme of "arbitrary punishment" in a number of instances; and last of all, contend that God must necessarily "*observe the same eternal principles*" in punishing "*each* and *all* of the transgressors of his law," which will be to inflict "arbitrary punishment" upon every individual who dies in his sins. Hence, as millions of wicked men go into eternity with no punishment except remorse of conscience, which the *Pro and Con* terms "*necessary punishment*," and which I have shown in a former chapter to be no punishment at all for sin, but merely the effect of sin, it follows that such wicked, unpunished sinners must receive arbitrary punishment at the hand of God in the *eternal* world, as certain as he is immutable, and deals with all upon the same *eternal principles* of justice! The *Pro and Con* himself admits, as before quoted, that God does not now, in this dispensation, inflict "arbitrary punishment," as he did in "scripture times," as he expresses it: and I really believe the man thinks he has luckily got entirely out of *scripture times*, from the sheer indifference with which he treats the Bible. He tells us that arbitrary punishment, which God inflicted upon the Sodomites, &c., is called his "strange work."—p. 245. But *strange* as it is, this very *Pro and Con* tells us, that the calamity which befel the Sodomites was no more than a "*suitable distinction*" between the righteous and the wicked!—pp. 262–3.

Now if God made a "suitable distinction" between the righteous and wicked, by pouring down fire and brimstone upon the latter, who, as the apostle teaches, suffered "the vengeance of *eternal fire*," will not such a distinction be required in the future state, seeing we have no such distinction since "scripture times," and since God will deal upon the same eternal principles "with each and all of the

transgressors of his law!" Now since the *Pro and Con* is compelled to admit that God will inflict "arbitrary punishment" in the eternal world, can that punishment be endless misery? Yes, for he tells us that such is "arbitrary punishment." Will you hear it?

"Can anybody see any necessary, any reasonable connection between the eating of an interdicted apple and the suffering in ceaseless fire? It is not even pretended by those who take *this view* of the subject, that the penalty threatened was otherwise than *arbitrary*."—p. 245.

"For is it pretended that between the sinful acts of men, and their suffering in ceaseless fire, there is any necessary connection? If not, then the penalty is *arbitrary*."—p. 73.

Take notice; Jesus Christ is to "execute judgment," and consequently to be the "*executioner*" under the present dispensation, as all the apostles have taught. This proves that all punishment for sin is *arbitrary*, and none of it that "*necessary* punishment," of which the *Pro and Con* speaks, for he positively teaches, as already quoted, that in such punishment, "*sin is its own executioner.*" Hence, it must be evident that this is not the punishment of the New Testament, for Christ is the *executioner* of that! But hear him again:

"Have punishments a *reforming tendency?* If they have not, then must it be admitted that they are *useless;* for they cannot repair the injury done by the offender; they do not *prevent others from committing the same offense.*"—p. 242.

Observe, reader, that if punishment has any other design, except the *reformation of the offender*, it is "*useless,*" and hence, it must have but *one object!* This, the above quotation plainly teaches. Now for a contradiction. Take notice, that the one and only *object* of punishment is *reformation.* On the same page he declares that "punishment is of *two kinds* as to its nature, *several as to its objects.*" Now if *reformation* be the only *object* of punishment, where I ask, does he find his "*several objects?*" But hear him again: After admitting (as before quoted) that God had inflicted "arbitrary punishments," in the case of Sodom, Babylon, Jerusalem, &c., he remarks:

"It is not pretended that in this class of punishments the *reformation of the punished* is the immediate object; they are meant as *examples to others*, and therefore they are *benevolent*, although not directly so to the *subjects themselves.*"—p. 245.

In the previous quotation he states that if punishments be not for the *reformation* of the offender, it is "useless." Then, of course, God inflicted useless punishment upon the Sodomites, and hence the fact of endless misery being "useless," as the *Pro and Con* argues, is no proof that God will not inflict it! But he admits that the punishment of the Sodomites was "*meant as an example to others,*" and of course to prevent others from committing similar offenses. In this he agrees with the Apostle Jude; but in agreeing with him, he contradicts himself, for he declares in one of the above quotations, that punishments "*do not prevent others from committing the same offense,*" and hence he concludes that they are "useless," if they have any other "object" except the *reformation of the offender!*

How cautious is the above! He says that in the destruction of Sodom "it is not pretended that * * * * the *reformation* of the punished is the *immediate* object!" Then it must have been a *remote* object! Will the *Pro and Con* tell us how this roasting process with fire and brimstone *reformed* the Sodomites immediately or remotely, unless it was in the manner described by the poet?

> "So all the guilty Sodomites,
> When God bade Lot retire,
> Went in a trice to Paradise
> On rapid wings of fire!"

Thus, according to this improved theology, God in "scripture times" *remotely* reformed sinners, when they became too bad to live on earth, by killing them and taking them *immediately* to heaven! Why then should the cautious Mr. Rogers add "Although not *directly* so to the subjects themselves"? (see last quotation). We would consider such punishment "directly" "benevolent," even if it is somewhat *arbitrary*, if the above stanza may be taken as evidence. If this be not a jumble of self-contradictory nonsense then I know not what is. But more about this "reforming tendency."

"But *why* should we be censured and *punished* for *sin*, if its commission be but the result of foreordination? You are answered, reader, so soon as you *answer* yourself, *why* you *crush* with detestation the odious reptile under your foot, when you know that it cannot help being the reptile that it is."—p. 297.

I answer, that I do not "crush the odious reptile under my foot" for its reformation, certainly; neither does the Rev. George Rogers, but simply to get it out of the way so that it can do no injury. Hence, as God punishes the sinner, according to the *Pro and Con*, for the same object, he does not therefore punish him for his good, when he punishes arbitrarily, but for the good of others!

Next comes the judgment.

"I cannot be persuaded, my hearers, that the doctrine of a judgment after death has been productive of any benefit to mankind; whatever tends to encourage the impression that the retributions of guilt are distant, and uncertain as distant—*must necessarily be pernicious in its influence.*"—p. 218.

This, reader is a fair specimen of the *Pro and Con.* A judgment that is *distant* and *uncertain*, is "pernicious in its influence." Then, according to this, Christ and the apostles taught a most pernicious and licentious doctrine; for the "everlasting punishment,"—"eternal damnation,"—"fiery indignation,"—"everlasting fire,"—"unquenchable fire," &c., &c., with which they threatened the wicked, were all *distant*—yes, *distant* to the destruction of Jerusalem! And they were as "uncertain as distant," for the wicked Jews could have sinned on, till just before that judgment, and then have committed suicide and escaped safely to heaven. Or the very murderers of Jesus could have continued in their wickedness until just before that calamity occurred, and then embraced Christianity; and the Pro and

*Con* informs us that not one Christian perished in that seige! Thus also they might have escaped, and thus the wicked had *two chances* of escape from the "judgment day" of Universalism, whilst they have but *one chance* to escape the future and "eternal judgment" of the apostles, and that is, by a reformation of life! And can a doctrine be pernicious in its influence which holds out an "eternal judgment," from which there is no escape but by submitting to God's law? The *Pro and Con* should remember that "they who live in glass houses should not throw stones at their neighbors." He quotes Solomon to prove that the wicked will take advantage of this doctrine. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." [Ec. 8. 11.] It is true the wicked *may* take advantage of this doctrine, but the fact that they have no lease of their lives, and not knowing what instant they may be struck dead, and knowing also that if they die in their sins their destiny is eternally fixed, no man, therefore, except one who is given over to hardness of heart and a reprobate mind by some such false teaching as Universalism, would risk his eternal all if he firmly believed this doctrine; and if he had become thus depraved there is no probability of his ever reforming. The *Pro and Con* should be the last man to talk about the wicked taking advantage of the doctrine of a future judgment when he is inculcating a doctrine which is calculated in every way to console a wicked man, and encourage him to continue in his sins, with the absolute certainty, that they shall all be overruled for his good, and will *enhance his happiness for eternity!* The most palpable subterfuge, to which the *Pro and Con* resorts, is, that the penalty of Universalism is absolutely certain, and from it there is no possible escape. I have noticed this in another part of this work (chap. 7,) but will here remark that we believe, as much as do Universalists, that from remorse of conscience (all the punishment Universalism holds out,) there is no possibility of escape until the conscience becomes *seared*, and hence we have all the punishment for which Universalists contend and just as certain too according to our view as it is according to theirs, and in addition to this, we hold out an eternal penalty which the sinner is assured will be inflicted unless a reformation of life takes place before death. Thus we have the advantage of the *Pro and Con* every way it can be turned. Suppose, as Solomon says, that the hearts of the wicked will be bent in them to do evil, because the penalty against an evil work was not executed speedily, would it not be worse, if, when the penalty was inflicted, they would not feel it or know any thing about it? which is absolutely the case, as regards the penalty of Universalism, with perhaps three-fourths of all the wicked on earth! When Noah (the preacher of righteousness) was proclaiming to the antediluvians, that in a Hundred and Twenty Years a most dreadful calamity would come upon them if they did *not repent*;—the *Pro and Con* would have informed him, had he

been there, that he was preaching a most "pernicious,"—most licentious doctrine, in putting the judgment off so far! And would no doubt, have challenged him to a discussion of his orthodox principles: and yet, that old orthodox Noah preached nothing but what the Almighty had directed! Hear the *Pro and Con* again:

"The Jews deemed better of their God,—more philosophically—an all-seeing—all-pervading Spirit—all just, and pure, and good—whose tribunal is in the bosom of every thinking being: what needs he of an external bar?—of books and witness, and other of the forms and ceremonies of trial? The Jewish scriptures sanction no such puerile representations of the infinite Jehovah. Shame to Christians, that they have copied the crude conceptions of heathenism?"—p. 216.

Truly this is wholesaling matters with a rush! "The Jewish scriptures sanction no such puerile representations of the infinite Jehovah!" This is not true (leaving out the "puerile,") for the Jewish scriptures inform us that the Almighty himself did require, in order to carry on his government, an "external bar," "books and witnesses;" and a man was brought before that "external bar," and his case was adjudicated and decided according to the "books" of Moses which God had given, and which he had written with his own finger; and the man thus condemned "died without mercy under two or three *witnesses*." If God's "tribunal is in the bosom of every thinking being," and he has no need of "*books*," why did he give us the Old and New Testaments? If the Almighty had no more need of those books than the *Pro and Con* has, then surely he would never have been to the trouble of making them!

What a "puerile" and ridiculous thing it was for the Israelites to sprinkle the blood of the paschal lamb upon their door-lintals, that the "infinite Jehovah," when he came down that night to slay the Egyptians, might not make a mistake and hit upon the wrong ones! "Shame to you, Moses, that you have copied the crude conceptions of heathenism!" It is really time, in all gravity, that such outrageous infidelity among professed believers was done away with. And the *Pro and Con* does absolutely repent of it when he gets toward the close of his book:

"I am *sick* of this hypercritical *scepticism*, [good!] which is ever directing its vulture glance to the *spying out of difficulties* in every thing *proposed to its faith*, and *rejecting* [just as you did, Sir!] with *self-complacent decisiveness* all that comes not within the *narrow compass of its apprehension*!"—p. 344.

No wonder the man got ashamed of "this hypercritical scepticism," for whoever reads the three hundred and forty pages of his book preceding this quotation, if he does not find enough of that commodity to make any reasonable Christian man disgusted, then I'll give up! Universalism and scepticism are so nearly allied, that let a Universalist preach many of his peculiarities in an infidel neighborhood where he was not known, and he would be claimed as a fellow-helper by all the free-thinkers in the audience. The author of

the *Pro and Con*, in his "*Memoranda*," gives an incident of his labors, which proves this assertion:

"Returning to Delhi, I had a less pleasant meeting than *before*. I then discovered that the principal men of the town were sceptics, of the Owen School, and that they had mistaken me to be of similar sentiments."—p. 102.

He however proceeded, as he tells us on the next page, to correct their mistake, and accordingly pointed out the difference between Universalism and scepticism, and in conclusion he informs us that "this address was respectfully received by the audience." No wonder, for they were mostly Deists, and they are the very men who will receive Universalism with "all readiness of mind," as the best cloak for their unbelief. Hence, you hardly ever find an avowed infidel where Universalism flourishes. The latter is the most popular of the two, and hence names are shifted, which is the only thing requisite in making sceptics converts to Universalism! This same author in his "*Memoranda*" bears me out also in this statement:

"In any community of which Universalists compose a considerable portion, you shall invariably find fewer infidels [i. e. *avowed* infidels,] than where orthodox forms of religion have exclusive sway."—p. 107.

This can all be accounted for, without admitting Universalism to be either true or reasonable, neither of which it is, most assuredly.

Speaking, in the same work, of young Universalist preachers opposing orthodoxy, and showing off their "smartness" by lampooning *creeds*, spurred onward by the "smiles," "nods," and "grins," of the audience, he makes the following very true remark:

"But ah me! how little worth is this sort of incense? [these *signs* of approval.] From whom comes it in general? From the wise? the good? the sincere? the lover of Christ's cause? Seldom from either. More generally, rather, from those who would *applaud Paine's ribaldries at the expense of all religion*."—p. 397.

Now does not the reader know, if he has ever heard a "*smart*" Universalist preacher declaim against orthodoxy, that the whole audience of Universalists, little and big, old and young, will cheer and encourage him with just such "smiles," "grins," and "nods," which this author testifies to come, not from the *wise*, the *good*, the *since, e.* or the *lover of Christ's cause;* but from "those who would *applaud Paine's ribaldries at the expense of all religion?*" From this it is manifest that nineteen-twentieths of Universalists are infidels at heart, as testified to by this eminent Universalist minister—neither *wise, good, sincere*, nor *lovers of Christ's cause!* A poor recommendation truly! But hear him further:

"'What can we reason but from what we know?' the Poet asks; and from all that we can know at present, the probabilities seem decidedly *against* the supposition that it is *possible* for Jehovah to create sentient creatures who, from the commencement of their existence shall be in possession of absolute and unmixed felicity; it seems a fair presumption that, *were it possible* his infinite goodness *would have so created* and *circumstanced them*, that to all eternity all creatures should be utter strangers to *want*, or *pain*, or to *anything which would render their happiness incomplete*."—p. 327.

Now, reader, take notice;—the *Pro and Con* has absolutely come out, and acknowledged that it was not *possible* for God to create man and keep him from being sinful and miserable, and that if he *could* have done it he *would* have so created him that he would to all eternity be an entire stranger to everything like *want*, or *pain*, or *anything* that would render his happiness incomplete. Well, since God could not *possibly* prevent sin and suffering from having an existence, how in the name of reason can he ever annihilate them, since his power can be no stronger at one time than at another? If God, in the creation could not make man absolutely exempt from the possibility of being sinful and miserable, how can the *Pro and Con* infer that God who is without variableness or shadow of turning, will be able to better the matter in the resurrection? But upon this point also he *contradicts* himself.

"On this ground alone, as I conceive [i. e. that sin shall result in good,] can the Almighty ruler of the universe be acquitted of folly or cruelty, in having permitted sin and suffering to enter the world—for *none are so weak as to suppose that he could not have had it otherwise!*"—p. 91.

Yes, sir, you are just that "*weak*" yourself! and it is my candid belief that you do not know what you believe, or by what motives you are actuated. Do you think, reader, that I am too severe? If you do, read the following from the preface to his "*Memoranda:*"

"When a man takes it upon himself to write his own history, he is, we may suppose, either moved thereto by a *propensity to egotism, or he* is persuaded that he is *fulfilling a duty to the public.*—With the former of these *motives* the author feels that he is liable to be *charged, with what truth God only knows; for he confesses that he himself does not!*"

But we pass on to notice about a dozen more contradictions. In trying to dispose of two texts of scripture, which he had brought up as objections to answer [i. e., Dan. 12. 2.; John 5. 28, 29.] he gives us the following:

"It is granted that the above texts are *parallel*, but this very admission is fatal to the objection; for Christ has fixed the *time* of the event to which *they* refer, [*both*, mark it,] at the period of the *overthrow of the Jewish state.* Thus much as regards the *time* of this resurrection, which, instead of being at the *end of the world*, as our opponent thinks, *is past by nearly eighteen centuries.*"—pp. 221-2.

The reader will bear in mind that the resurrection spoken of in these two texts, "*is past by nearly eighteen centuries,*" and was fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem or "*the overthrow of the Jewish state.*" Now turn over only *one leaf* and read:

"On the whole then, it must, I think, be manifest to the enlightened reader, that the import of the *passages* before us is, that Christ, by the word of his gospel, and the ministry of his apostles, was about to call men forth from the graves of superstition and ignorance, in which they had long been buried. *This important work had already begun in Christ's day* [not at the *destruction* of *Jerusalem!*] but it was destined soon to take effect upon a much wider scale, and, eventually, *it shall be universal in its extent.*"—p. 224.

How a man can so flatly contradict himself within two pages, is

wholly unaccountable, only upon the ground that he is endeavoring to defend an irreconcilable and contradictory doctrine. First he tells us that it referred to the "overthrow of the Jewish state," as the time of its fulfillment, and then informs us that it was fulfilling *"in Christ's day!"* First he tells us that it is past by nearly "eighteen centuries," and then informs us that *"eventually it shall be universal in its extent."* This, mark it, is his own language, *"it shall be,"* which places this resurrection still in the future to us; and still it was fulfilled "nearly eighteen centuries" ago! If the *Pro and Con* can have a *universal* resurrection fulfilled "eighteen centuries" ago, may not his *universal* salvation be all over with ever since the destruction of Jerusalem, and all who have since lived be eternally lost? But if the *Pro and Con* would prefer the credit of contradicting himself rather than to have his universal salvation *end* at the "overthrow of the Jewish state," he may have it so; and then it follows that, as this resurrection is to be "universal" it will embrace the Sodomites and antediluvians, which proves it to refer to the *literal* resurrection; and thus the *Pro and Con* is unavoidably compelled to admit that in the literal resurrection some shall come forth *"to the resurrection of damnation!"* Hard, I know, but it is fair! It is a trap of his own setting. But when Christ speaks of "graves," "resurrection," *coming forth*, etc., he does not mean what he says, according to the *Pro and Con*. No, he means something altogether different! Mark this, and read again:

"I sincerely thank my friend for the conciseness and explicitness of his objections; it shall not be the fault of my will if my replies are not equally concise and explicit. 1st. He grants the grammatical correctness of the criticism on the text, which makes nations (not individuals) the parties arraigned and separated in the judgment that it foretells; yet he thinks Christ could not have *designed what his language fairly means! This, in effect, is to accuse him of not having known how to express his meaning!*"—pp. 179-180.

Yes, and the Reverend author of the *Pro and Con* is the very man who has made out Christ just that ignorant, in his comment on John 5. 29, just examined! "Out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee." Again:

"It is a common practice to refer this passage to the literal termination of this world, but such is obviously not the scriptural meaning of the phrase 'end of the world;' it *never* requires such an *interpretation*, but on the contrary *invariably means* the *consummation* of the *Jewish economy!* Paul calls the *period* at which *Christ died*, 'the end of the world.' [Heb. 9. 26.]"—p. 170.

Hence "the *period* at which *Christ died*" was "the consummation of the *Jewish economy*," for he tells us that "the end of the world" does refer to Christ's death, and "invariably *means the consummation of the Jewish economy.*" Then, of course, when the disciples wished to know of the Lord what should be the "sign of his coming, and of the *end of the world*," (Math. 24. 3,) they referred *to his death!* Bear this in mind.

"Third: 'And of the end of the world?' This, however, is not properly a third question, but merely a member of the second: 'the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world,' (*tou aionos*) *end of the age* or *Mosaic economy*; for the disciples understood that the *destruction* of the *city* and *temple would close* the *Jewish dispensation*."—p. 183.

This is so gross and palpable a contradiction, that the most superficial reader can discover it, without comment. Again: in commenting on 2 Pet. 3. 5–7, he admits that the antediluvians who were destroyed in the flood are yet to be destroyed by fire! Read what follows:

"Should it be objected, that, inasmuch as there is an allusion in the connection to the destruction of the old world by water, and it took place literally, therefore we ought to understand the predicted destruction by fire in a similar sense. I answer that in point of fact, the old world *was not itself*, destroyed by the deluge; *the inhabitants only were destroyed*—and the writer himself saith *the same world is kept in store reserved unto fire*." p. 207.

Now as the *old world* which was destroyed, signifies the *inhabitants*, and as "the *same world* is kept in store *reserved unto fire*," as the *Pro and Con* here testifies, it follows that the *inhabitants*, who were destroyed in the flood are yet to be destroyed by *fire*; and this cannot be, as a matter of course, till the resurrection, when the antediluvians shall come forth "to the resurrection of damnation." Thus the *Pro and Con* admits that Peter is speaking of a judgment at the end of time! But now comes the contradiction:

"From the whole then it must be apparent to all my attentive hearers that Peter is speaking of *no other judgment* than that which was to accompany the *dissolution* of the *old covenant*, and the *ushering in* of the *new*."—Ibid.

And as the end of the old covenant, or the Jewish dispensation, was at the death of Christ, which the *Pro and Con* asserts, as already quoted, it follows that the whole of this judgment scene was past, when Peter penned this prediction, and yet the ignorant apostle knew no better than to put the matter off still in the future! We shall now notice the comment on the text, "And so *all Israel* shall be saved." Rom. 11. 26. You will observe that he quotes this text to prove the universal salvation of the Jewish nation, and hence must, as a necessary conclusion, understand "*all Israel*" to embrace those millions of Jews who had already been dead and in eternity for hundreds of years.

"That Paul was not speaking of Israel in any such restricted sense, is exceedingly obvious. 'All Israel shall be saved,' the *same Israel* that were *yet in their sins*, that '*were blinded*,' that '*were enemies to the gospel*,' that were *all* '*concluded in unbelief*.' And this is to be effected when 'the fullness of the Gentiles be come in."—p. 117.

This proves that those wicked Jews who had fallen in the wilderness "*were yet in their sins*,"—"*were included in unbelief*," and "*were enemies to the gospel*." Consequently they had been suffering torment in the eternal world for nearly two thousand years, since the *Pro and Con* teaches that sin and misery always go hand in hand.

Does this look like all sin and suffering being confined to this life? Not hardly! But again:

"I choose to assume that man is in some degree master of his volitions, and the actions thence ensuing; that in many cases *he could both will, and do otherwise than as he does.*"—p. 133.

Observe now how this will harmonize with the following:

"You must see, reader, that the notion of a *free will* is a *chimera.*"—p. 290.

"Believe me, reader, that it is not possible to avoid the conclusion, that all events take place agreeably to the unalterable decrees of Jehovah."—p. 300.

Now I ask the common sense of the reader how a man "could both *will* and *do* otherwise than as he does," if "the notion of a *free will* is a *chimera,*" and if "all events take place agreeably to the *unalterable decrees of Jehovah.*" Did God unalterably decree that man should do just as he does? Yes, if he decrees all events. Can man do differently from what he does? If so, then he can alter "the *unalterable decrees* of Jehovah." If God had *unalterably decreed* all events, then it would be out of the question for a man to feel the least *responsibility* for his conduct unless he thinks he has it in his power to break those "*unalterable decrees!*" Does the *Pro and Con* think they can be broken? He does, as I will now prove:

"On the 5th the congregation were most imminently endangered by a storm which blew up, just as I had got through prayer. The storm which arose was one of wind, lightning and hail; I confess that I felt a *fearful responsibility resting on me,* in having been the occasion of so many people being brought together in so dangerous a situation."—"*Memoranda,*" p. 321.

This is truly singular,—he "felt a *fearful responsibility* resting on him," for doing what God, from all eternity had *unalterably decreed* that he should do at that very time. and which he was no more to blame for than he was for that storm coming up, since "the notion of *a free will is a chimera!*" Suppose that storm had blown the house down and killed the whole audience, it would have been nothing to fret about, as *it,* too, would have been according to the unalterable decree of Jehovah! Why then feel a "fearful responsibility," let come what will? But more upon this point. It must, according to the *Pro and Con,* have been unalterably decreed from all eternity that Christ should die at the very time he did!

"We find, indeed, that Jesus seized upon every fitting occasion for communicating these stupendous matters to his countrymen, not, to be sure, in plain language, for they would not have borne it; he would thus have enraged them against him, and the catastrophe of his death would have been *hastened before* the other great objects of his mission were fulfilled."—p. 172.

"We are directly informed that 'the common people heard him gladly;' (Mark 12. 37,) but for them, he would have *fallen a victim* to the malice of his foes *before he did.*"—p. 190.

Thus, we learn, that had it not been for the mere circumstance of Christ making use of mysterious language, and of the common people *being present* on one occasion, the priests and Pharisees would

have killed Christ long before his time, and thus have broken "the unalterable decree of Jehovah!" These circumstances were possible, hence it was possible to break that *unalterable decree;* and if one of God's unalterable decrees could have been broken, may it not be possible for another to give way? And where then is the absolute certainty of universal salvation, even admitting that God has decreed it?

"It is somewhat singular, nay, it is very remarkable, that while all other nations had their respective hells, the Jews, who were especially instructed in religion by Jehovah for the space of 2,000 years, *were without any ideas on that subject.*"—p. 278.

Yes, these Jews had no idea of hell punishment, yet he tells us, that in the days of the Saviour "*these classes themselves believed in endless misery.*" (p. 190.) Yet they "*were without any ideas on the subject!*"

"To me this seems the most probable construction of the text; for *gehenna* was associated in the minds of the Jews *with everything horrid, loathsome* and *abominable.*"—p. 277.

Well, as the Jews had an idea of "*endless misery,*" they must have understood *gehenna* to signify that: for, mark the fact, it "was associated in the minds of Jews, with everything *horrid, loathsome* and *abominable!*" Now let us see if the *Pro and Con* will not contradict all this, and tell us that *gehenna* (the word translated hell) was not understood to signify any such thing!

"Others again think that Jehovah is alluded to as the object to be feared, not on the ground of his ability to destroy in a hell beyond the grave, for *gehenna,* in that day, *was not received in any such sense.*"—p. 277.

Then it was not understood as signifying every thing "*horrid,*" for the *Pro and Con* tells us that the Jews at that time held the "*horrid*" dogma of an endless hell, so that there is a contradiction out some place! But again:

"But my opponent represents it [Universalism] as holding out encouragement to sin, by telling men, that the shorter they render their stay on earth by their crimes, the sooner they will get to heaven. Now this objection to Universalism rests upon the false assumption that men pass, according to this theory, immediately from earth to *heaven.* This is a *mistake!*"—p. 149.

Now you will observe, that men do not go to heaven when they die, but to an intermediate state where they remain until the resurrection when they are admitted to heaven; and this is the only reason he can assign why men should not commit suicide if Universalism be true! As this is the only objection to suicide, we will let this author clear it up in his "Memoranda,"

"During the day the preaching was done in the woods, and at night in the Union meeting-house. The assemblage present was large, perhaps numbering two thousand persons. Many were present from distances of fifty or sixty miles, and many also who were zealous and strong men in our Israel. There were Jacob Felter, *now in heaven.*"—p. 183.

Thus Jabob Felter went to *heaven* when he died without waiting for the resurrection, and as Universalism teaches that sin cannot extend beyond this life, and consequently that all are equally safe after death, it follows that other folks can go to heaven at death as well as Jacob Felter, it matters not what death they die, only if they die by suicide they will get there the sooner, which makes it preferable to any other! But he admits that Paul expressed great anxiety with regard to the ultimate salvation of the Jews. Notice his language:

"Now for the Jews. Was Paul a believer in their *ultimate salvation? What*, then, means the *anxiety* expressed in the following language? 'Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be *saved*;' (Rom. 10. 1,) and the following is even more expressive of anxiety [i. e, *anxiety* of course for their *ultimate salvation*;] 'I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that *I have great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart*, for I could wish that myself were *accursed* from Christ, for my *brethren*, my kinsmen according to the flesh.' (Rom. 9. 1-3.)" p. 115.

The reader will bear in mind that all this *anxiety, sorrow*, and *heaviness of heart* which the apostle experienced, was with regard to the Jews, "ultimate salvation," which is a palpable acknowledgement that their ultimate salvation was *doubtful*. But the *Pro and Con*, as usual, turns round and contradicts himself; or rather he contradicts himself before he has time to turn round:

"This language, dear reader, is easily accounted for, without resolving it into the *fears he entertained for their fate beyond the grave*; for on that head, as shall be shown, he had no fears whatever."—Ibid.

He admits that Cornelius would not have been saved in the future life had he not feared God and worked righteousness, and had he died without knowing Christ.

"That Cornelius would have been saved in the *future life*, even though he had not known Christ in this, *is evident from Peter's own words on the occasion:* 'Of a truth,' said he, 'I preceive that God is no respector of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him.'"—*Memoranda*, p. 135.

Thus, the only reason why Cornelius would have been saved in the future life, had he not known Christ in this, is, that he *feared God and worked righteousness!* Had he not feared God and worked righteousness, and had he died before he came to know Christ, he would, according to a fair construction of this author's language, have failed of the ultimate salvation!

After quoting the text which speaks of the destruction of both soul and body in hell, he gives two reasons why it cannot refer to punishment beyond the grave, the latter of which we quote.

"The second fact is, that the *body*, which those whom they were told not to fear had the power to kill, is not *liable to destruction in a hell beyond the grave*, but *returns to the dust of the earth from whence it originated. How, then*, can gehenna, in this instance, imply a place of torment in a future state? It cannot!"—p. 276.

*In this*, as the most superficial reader can discover, he denies the

resurrection of the body. It cannot, he tells us, be punished beyond the grave, from the fact that it *returns to the dust of the earth*, from whence it originated. See, now, if he does not get "*sick*" of this likewise!

"Paul assuredly speaks of a rising again of the *same body which is laid in the grave*. So also is the resurrection of the dead: *it* is sown in *corruption*, *it* is raised in *incorruption*."—p. 343.

This, mark it, is the same page where he got "*sick* of that *hypercritical scepticism*, which is ever directing its vulture glance to the spying out of *difficulties* in everything proposed to its faith," just as he had done in more than fifty instances before, one of which is quoted above. It was "proposed to his faith" by the Lord himself, that we should not fear man, who only had power to kill the body, but that we should fear God, who was able to destroy *both soul and body in hell:* but this "hypercritical sceptic" commenced immediately the "spying out of difficulties." This is one way he has of disposing of a text which contradicts his theory; and another is, by making it part literal and part figurative, or by making it all figurative, whichever suits his purpose best. This I will show to be no misrepresentation. Look at his exposition of the rich man and Lazarus.

"By the 'rich man' is meant the Jewish nation, which for centuries had abounded in all spiritual privileges, *in this sense* 'they fared sumptuously every day,' and in the persons of their priesthood were *literally clad* '*in purple and fine linen*.' Christ represents Abraham as saying in regard to them, 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they be persuaded though one *rose from the dead*,' which was *literally true*, for Christ had *actually raised one Lazarus to life*, and they yet remained as unbelieving as before."—p. 168.

Thus the "*rich man*" was a figure, but his "*purple and fine linen*" was *literal*:—Lazarus was *literal*, and Christ *literally* raised him from the dead; but the gulf was a figure, and signified moral *blindness!* This is certainly an accommodating parable. But there is a serious difficulty here in the way, according to the above exposition. The rich man, who had died and gone to hell, signifies the whole Jewish nation. But he had five brethren; who were they? O, they were the Jewish nation too, according to the *Pro and Con*, for he takes the language of Abraham concerning them, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets," &c., and applies it to the Jewish nation, as you will see by the above quotation.

I will now notice his evasion of the text in Peter, relative to the "new heavens and the new earth," as a specimen of Universalism upon all puzzling points. By a little attention to this example, the reader will be enabled to foil this system in its most successful attempts at evasion.

"Now that the 13th verse figuratively represents the gospel state, no attentive student of the Bible will question. 'Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.' (2 Peter 3. 13.) While

compare the following in Isaiah: 'For behold I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy; and the voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall build houses and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them,' &c. [Isaiah 65. 17-20.] This cannot belong to eternity, for it is presumed that people will not there *build houses*, nor *plant vineyards*, nor die even in their *hundredth year*."—p. 206.

You will discover, reader, that in order to carry his point, the *Pro and Con* first assumes that the text in Peter is figurative;—then quotes the text in Isaiah to prove it; but in order that this text prove his point, he assumes that *building houses, planting vineyards*, &c., are to be understood *literally*, and this being so, it follows that the *new heavens* and *new earth* are *figurative!* But I wonder if the *Pro and Con* thinks us all a set of dupes, and that we will sit dormant and let him *assume* the eyes out of our heads? We have as good a right (yes, far better) to assume that the *new heavens* and *new earth* (the only very important matter in the prediction) are *literal*, and that the inferior and minor points, such as *building houses* and *planting vineyards* are to be understood as a figurative representation of that "*moral advancement*," which the *Pro and Con* has taught us will be "*progressive*" in the eternal world! This is a principle, I venture the assertion, that Universalists never thought of. They seem to consider themselves a highly favored and privileged people, and that the orthodox are compelled to bow with reverential submission to their whims and assumptions. It is hoped, however, that the above will teach them a lesson. But the *Pro and Con* must necessarily contradict himself upon this point, as it would be a departure from a general principle should he not. He argues, as above quoted, that the new heavens and new earth meant the gospel dispensation, and that they were created, of course, when the church of Christ commenced.

"Thanks be to God! I lie under no such obligation! The light of his word shines sufficiently bright on the pathway of my inquiries on these subjects to satisfy my understanding and my hopes. It informs me that 'in the *beginning* God *created* the *heavens* and the *earth*,' but no mention is made of his having created a hell. So also at the *conclusion* it speaks of 'a *new heaven* and a *new earth*,' but nothing whatever of a new hell."—p. 280.

Thus he admits that the "*new heavens and new earth*" are put in contrast with the "*heavens and earth*" which *God created* "in the beginning," which were *literal* of course; and hence the "new heavens and new earth" must also be *literal*, as the apostles could not be guilty of such nonsense as contrasting the commencement of a dispensation with the creation of the literal heavens and earth! But the first heaven and earth was created "in the beginning," that is, the beginning of time, and the *Pro and Con* puts the new *heavens and new earth* "at the *conclusion*," which places them still

in the future, as time has not yet certainly come to a "*conclusion.*" Again: After telling us that the text in Isaiah, relative to the new heavens and new earth, could not refer to the future state, but signified the Christian dispensation, he adds:

"John, in Revelations, describes the *same state of things*—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and there was no more sea. And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away *all tears from their eyes;* and there shall be *no more death,* neither *sorrow* nor *crying,* neither shall there be *any more pain; for the former things are passed away.*'"—p. 206.

The reader will bear in mind that this is all *figurative,* according to the *Pro and Con,* belonging to *this world* and does not refer to the future state! *No more death—no more tears—no more sorrow, "for the former things are passed away,"*—all this is *figurative* and belongs to this life! But let us read again:

"Undoubtedly the several passages in this book [Revelations] which speak of these events, are to be understood as implying, that under the benign government of Messiah *all evils,* both physical and moral, shall come to an *ultimate end; no more tears—no more night—no more death—no more sin—no more sickness nor sorrow, 'for the former things shall be done away'*—no farther need of *sun,* nor *moon,* for the *quenchless* and unsettling glory of Jehovah shall be the *future light of all intelligences forever!*"—p. 217.

*Ten pages* back it all belonged to this present time, and did not refer to the future state at all; but now he gets "sick" of this view, and comes to the conclusion that it refers to that period when "*all evils, both physical and moral, shall come to an ultimate end,*" and that it refers to that state of existence where "Jehovah shall be the future light of *all intelligences* forever," which most flatly contradicts his former position, that it belongs to *this life;* for the *Pro and Con* will not contend that "*all intelligences*" enjoy that light in this world!

"We see not, as sees the all-seeing God: he saw Montezuma, for example, suffering under the cruelties of Cortez: perhaps also he had oft seen others suffering under the cruelties of Montezuma, and in that case the sufferings of the latter were but a *just measure of retribution.*"—p. 201.

But suppose Montezuma had escaped these cruelties, he would consequently have gone into eternity without "*a just measure of retribution,*" and as certain as God is *just,* he would have received it in the eternal world! Look at that sailor—that pirate, who has *tortured* and *butchered* his hundreds of innocent men, women, and children, and finally he drops into eternity with less sufferings than men in general experience:—where does he get his "*just measure of retribution?*" Not in this life certainly, and hence he must get it in eternity! But the *Pro and Con* will say, as he frequently does, that his "just measure of retribution" was the compunctions of con-

science which he experienced, as he committed the crimes. But how did it happen that Montezuma did not get his "just measure of retribution" from the *compunctions* of conscience, without having to suffer under the cruelties of Cortez? Conscience, it appears in that case, could not meet the demands of justice! But we will now let the *Pro and Con* decide how conscience operates upon that sailor.

"The cheek of the mariner is blanched with dismay, and the prayer of agony quivers on his lips, when his storm-tossed vessel seems on the point of being engulfed in the troubled element beneath him; but the danger passed, he laughs at his fears and *blasphemes* the name of God *without compunction!*"—p. 199.

This is admitting that the conscience of a wicked man will not *goad* him, only when he is about to be launched into the realities of a dreadful eternity. Had that *mariner* been a thorough-bred Universalist, his conscience would have felt no remorse, and his soul would not have been thus overwhelmed with alarm, when he came to stand upon the precincts of eternity. It was the fear of a judgment after death which so harrowed up his guilty soul, as the *Pro and Con* admits, in the sentence just preceding this quotation! Now, as he confesses that those wicked mariners will "*blaspheme* the name of God *without compunction*," how will they get "*a just measure of retribution*," if they continue thus to blaspheme the name of God for years, as hundreds of them do, and finally go into eternity in an instant, without even time to feel remorse? If Montezuma got "*a just measure of retribution*" and no more than justice, then these blaspheming mariners must suffer for their sins in the future life. But how much punishment must they endure? Read the following:

"The law of God, speaking of it not in a particular, but in a general sense, is a copy of his eternal perfections—is a necessary emanation from his pure and holy nature. On his law, therefore, the divine being has stamped the impress of himself. No thinking man will hesitate a moment to admit this fact."—p. 70.

Thus he admits that the "*law of God*" is *infinite*, as it is "*a copy of his eternal perfections*"—"a necessary *emanation from his pure and holy nature*," on which he "has stamped the *impress* of himself!" As the law of God is thus declared to be *infinite*, its penalties must, like itself, be also *infinite*, as penalties, in one sense, are a component part of the law; and thus we have *infinite punishment* as a necessary and logical conclusion. But he makes out that the Almighty himself will not endure in the future state.

"My opponent's supposition, then, you perceive, that the everlasting *kingdom of Christ* is in eternity, is quite wide of the fact."—p. 140.

Thus he makes out that the *kingdom of Christ* will not exted into eternity, but will *end with time.*

"The rising from them a line of prophets reaching down in unbroken succession to the rise of the prophet of prophets, Christ Messiah, through whom a more *glorious kingdom* should be established as wide in its sway as the extension of being, and *as lasting as the age of the Most High.*"—p. 287.

Then, of course, if the kingdom of Christ is "*as lasting as the age of the Most High*," and still will not extend into eternity, follows it not that the age of the Most High will cease with the duration of time? But this is not the worst of it, for the very logic of the *Pro and Con* makes out that there is no God, never was, nor ever will be?

"It is known to every attentive biblical student, that in figurative language a person was said to be the child of any *circumstances*, or *abstract quality* by which he was distinguished; hence we read of children of *light*—of the *day*—of *darkness*—of *Belial*—of *God*. If we are to understand any of these expressions in a *strict sense*, why not *all*?" Is it not obvious that *neither of these* were designed for a *literal interpretation*!"—p. 83.

Hence we are driven to the conclusion that *God* is no more than an "*abstract quality*,"—no more of a real being than "Belial," which the *Pro and Con* asserts to be nothing more than a mere *principle of evil!* I have always thought that Universalists could philosophize the Almighty out of existence upon the same principle they get rid of the devil: but I never knew before that any of them had tried the experiment! When I charge the *Pro and Con* with *absurdity*, the reader must discover that I have ground for the charge. See another example:

"Universalists maintain that God's love is *as strong* beyond, as on this side of the grave; and that what it *fails* of accomplishing here, it will *infallibly* accomplish hereafter."—p. 57.

Yes! because "God's love is *as strong*" and no stronger beyond the grave than it is this side, therefore it will certainly do in eternity *what it cannot do in time!* Of all men to draw conclusions, that *Pro and Con* takes the lead!

"For we think (as my opponent has said) that a *doctrine must be false*, which can fairly be *reduced to an absurdity*."—p. 148.

Then the *Pro and Con* "must be false," for a greater bundle of absurdities and self-contradictions was never wrapped up in the same amount of paper!

"It is admitted that if a doctrine be of *bad practical tendency*, however *plausible* in itself, *the divine sanction must not be claimed for it*."—p. 44.

We shall now close these strictures, by taking the *Pro and Con* at his own offer and upon his own *admission*. We have already proved Universalism to be of "bad practical tendency," as it holds out *infinite motives* to encourage the practice of wickedness and even suicide! But I will now prove the doctrine "of bad practical tendency" from another source—from facts—*stubborn* facts which the *Pro and Con* cannot and *dare not* controvert. These *facts* will be adduced from one of their own ministers—a strong defender of their faith, and one in high standing with them as an editor, and the author of a book which is lately from the press, and now being actively circulated by the denomination. The individual to whom I refer is known by the name of Rev. Lewis C. Todd, who once renounced Universalism,

after preaching the doctrine twelve years, but who has now gone back, and is acknowledged by the denomination, as above stated, to be an *honest* man, and an able advocate of the doctrine. If L. C. Todd was now opposed to Universalism I should deem it puerile, in the extreme, to quote from him; for let his testimony be true and even indisputable, it would still have no weight with Universalists; but as it is, they are bound to receive his testimony, so far as he states *facts* to which he was an eye and ear witness! Upon such matters he could not have been mistaken, as his acquaintance with the characters of Universalists generally was very extensive; and hence those facts which he claims to have seen and heard, *are true*, or else L. C. Todd was a *dishonest* man—a black-hearted hypocrite: and if he was dishonest then, he is not to be trusted now; but as all Universalists admit him to be an honest man *now*, they are compelled to admit that he was an honest man *then*, and ergo, the facts he states are *prima facie* evidence in this case. No man can disprove them but the author, and there is no way he can do it, but by proving himself one of the basest and most malicious falsifiers that ever lived! This, I presume, he will not undertake, and it is just as presumable that none of his brethren will undertake it for him! Hence his testimony, relative to the practical tendency of Universalism, and the character of its professors, *must be received!* I quote from his "*defence.*"

"I had seen the blessed influences of the doctrine spread out often on paper, but I could not see them anywhere else! No—God knows I am *honest* in this assertion. I do not feel to abuse the denomination, but it is true that I could not for my life see any good resulting to society from the sentiment. * * * * How it may be in New England I do not know; but *this I know* that it is not a misrepresentation of their religious condition so far as I know anything about them. I would not speak harshly of them. My affections have clung to them with almost the grasp of desperation. Certainly as a people they deserve no evil at my hands. I only wish to speak of the general effects of the doctrine. I know individuals among them, of the most amiable dispositions and characters, that would honor any profession. But I do not think their doctrine ever made them so. I candidly aver, in the fear of God, that I do not believe the doctrine ever made a single soul any better than he otherwise would have been, while it has been the means of removing necessary restraints, and giving latitude to thousands, whose propensities and passions needed restraint, whereby they have indulged in criminal pursuits and gone to perdition. *I only judge from what I know—from what I have seen* in reference to the general effects of the doctrine. 'The tree must be known by its fruits.' And after taking the *fruits* of the tree of Universalism into long, deliberate, and prayerful consideration, so far as I have ever *seen them*, I am compelled to conclude the tree is radically defective. When I learn of a

*single drunkard*, or *swearer*, or *gambler*, or *debauchee*, or *knave* being *reformed* in consequence of the Universalist doctrine, I shall think better of its influence than I do now, for it is my solemn opinion that such an instance never occurred. * * * * *

"All that, and much more, I told him [Mr. Stacy] expressing in the most pointed terms that I was dissatisfied and disappointed with the denomination on account of their *indifference to piety*, the *profanity, gambling*, and other *bad habits so common among them.* Making a few exceptions, I still say that *I have all the evidence that such a case admits of*, that a majority of the called Universalists are so unfriendly to religion that they would do *ten times more to destroy all religion* than to support any. They will support *Universalism*, but not as *religion*, nor for *religion*, but for the purpose of *destroying religion*, as it actually does to a great extent where it prevails. *Many of them have told me so!* There are some—very few—real Universalists, who will pay from principle; there are, besides, *Atheists, Deists, gamblers, drunkards*, and most all the *opposers of religion*, who are pleased with Universalism, and *take that name.* All these will pay for it, as the *surest* way to *do away religion!* Had I been a *sceptic* and *hypocrite*, I might now have been a professor of Universalism in the "full tide of successful experiment." * * * * I have had a great opportunity to know the character, views, and feelings of professed Universalists,—full as good an opportunity as Mr. Skinner. There are some, but not many Universalist preachers in the United States, that have had a more extensive opportunity to judge of the practical effects of the doctrine, from the conduct of its professors, than myself. I have found worthy and amiable persons attached to the doctrine—this is true—but such ones would freely acknowledge that the number of such was *very small* "around there." They generally thought its friends away off somewhere else were better; but I am satisfied that their leading characteristics, in any place or village, are the same in all, or nearly all places where they are to be found. As a general remark, wherever I went to promulgate the doctrine, many who stood forth as its friends were of the *lower part* of society. *Sabbath breakers, scoffers, tiplers, swearers*, and *gamblers* would gather around me with a warmth bordering on devotion. They found little to please them, however, in my preaching, *except the doctrine;* and often when I pointed out these vices in all their blackness to them, they would be offended; say I was bad as the orthodox; and *swear they wanted Universalism*, and not any of such "*reformation stuff*," and the like. Often have I been accosted in company by men reeling under their load of strong drink, who have held me by the hand to hear their assurances of applause, affection, and good will; and to hear them descant upon the "glorious plan of universal salvation," the "boundless extent of divine love," and to adduce their reasons, "strong as holy writ," to prove the truth of that sentiment, and the folly of everything else, till pale with disgust, or

suffused with shame, or half suffocated with their breath, I have forced myself away. * * * * So there is a kind of religious quackery in the land which affects great sympathy for the occasional evils connected with the doctrine of future retribution, but has no sympathy for the sufferings resulting from the vices which that doctrine would suppress—has no tender heart to "*wither*" over the *dissipation*, the *licentiousness*, the *crimes*, the *murders*, the *blasted hopes of parents*, the sighs of *heart-broken* wives and husbands, the *anguish* and *misery* of children beggared and orphaned in the *appalling career of vice*, the *agony* and *tears* and *shame* which mark the *footsteps of sin* which every where increase and spread with the *increase* and *spread* of *Universalism* and *infidelity*. I say *Universalism* and *infidelity*, because one is the general *precursor* of the other.

"Let these men boast of their charity; I know the doctrine they profess requires the exercise of charity—so does Christianity in all its forms. But I have read *ten periodical Universalist papers* for two years, and the *sarcasm* and *malignity* running through these papers against everything but their own interests had a powerful tendency in opening my eyes, and convincing me that there was *little or no religion among them*. In the winter before the renunciation, L. Davis, Esq., of Carroll, returned from Cincinnati, authorized to engage me to go there. He held out the most encouraging prospects in a pecuniary point of view, and urged me to go. And I will here remark that he is well known as a Universalist of the conscientious kind. And *he admitted to me that Universalists generally were not pious*, and that he had for years *mourned over the course they pursued in relation to religion*. * * * * Mr. Stacy cannot deny that ever since he has been in the western country, for some two or three years, whenever I have had an opportunity, I have been complaining of the *swearing*, *drinking*, *gambling*, and other *vicious habits among Universalists*, and the *entire want* of anything like a *religious course* among them. Mr. Stacy, too, always used to *admit that things were so;* and often expressed regret that it was so, but hoped that Universalists would some day take a different course. Almost a year before the renunciation I was at Warren, (Pa.,) preached in the morning and evening, and Mr. Sweet in the afternoon. Mr. Sweet was a Universalist preacher from Ohio, who had come there that day with Mr. Stacy. We, there, in company with others were talking that day on the character and religious course of Universalists generally. Mr. Sweet said he was generally and extensively acquainted with Universalists in Ohio,—that there was *very littte the appearance of religion or piety among them*,—that societies almost without number had been formed, but the members seemed to take no interest in the cause, and generally, within two or three years after their formation, some would join the orthodox, but most would avow Deism, and they would *cease to* be as societies. He represented them to be in a very dead, *low, and miserable* condition, as it respects religion; and he consid-

ered this to be the general condition of Universalists. Mr. Stacy was by, and did not deny that it was so, but said that we must try to bring about a better state of things. Others were present to hear some of the conversation. A person present at that time asked me why it was so, that Universalists would take such a course as they did; and I answered, 'The reason is, that the principal part of *Universalists* are *Deists* in reality;' the person replied: 'I believe in my soul they are.' This was in the presence of Mr. Stacy, and he *smiled*, which I considered his *assent* that it was *true*. I told Mr. Sweet that his description of Universalists would apply generally to them wherever I had been acquainted with them; and he told me he did not care about going among them if that were the case. And the 'unobtrusive practical virtue of Universalists' is, generally *Sabbath-breaking, profanity, intemperance*, contempt of all the appearances and means of *piety*, horrid fears of priestcraft, but no fears about any other craft; *gambling, laughing, scoffing and swearing about praying, preaching, religious meetings*, and *religious people*, finding contradictions in the Bible, and other great difficulties, etc., etc., etc. The author *saw these things* till his heart sickened. He was reading many Universalist periodicals, and became fully satisfied from the drift and general course of them that their secret object appeared to be, and their actual effect was, to *raise doubts* in the minds of their readers, on one religious subject after another, *till they should believe in none;* and by inuendoes and sarcastic reflections upon the errors of Christians, to spread abroad a deep and universal prejudice against a *gospel ministry*, the *Bible*, and *all religion*. He became satisfied beyond a *single doubt* that all this was *true*. He conversed also with many professors of Universalism at different times, and found *most all of them* to view the subject in the *same light*. Most all of them to be *enemies to Christianity*, and to consider the whole engine of Universalism now in the United States to be a shrewd and well concerted scheme to bring together the elements and efforts of unbelief, to overthrow in the end the Christian religion. His candid opinion is, *and has long been*, that *ninety-nine* out of *a hundred* who profess publicly to be Universalists, *are unbelievers in divine revelation*. I say this in the fear of God, as the result of *all I know of them*. That the nature of their doctrine is such that most of them [the preachers] as well as their hearers, become so much tinctured with *scepticism*, that their teachings lead to the same end that *open infidelity* would. That there are some honest and sincere both among teachers and people, I have no doubt. There are a few learned, gifted, and talented men among the preachers who would be useful in a good cause; but many of them are illiterate, and only qualified for levity, scurrility and miserable satire. Winchester and Murray, I think, were pious, but their system was no sooner abroad than *infidels*, who had been foiled in their recent open attacks on religion, discovered in Universalism a disguise for their doctrines, and spread it forth with zeal,

fully satisfied that it would answer their purpose just as well. Hence the numerous conversions of *infidels* to *Universalism*, which signifies nothing more than the shifting of an unpopular name for one more plausible. *Infidels* and *loose wicked men* have *cherished* the doctrine enough to make it suspicious and offensive to the Christian, were there no other objection to it. * * * The author of this work once preached Universalism in Ripley, Chautauque Co. (N. Y.,), where he found among his hearers a *Universalist drunkard*—he had been a *preacher!* But he was a constant attendant on the preaching. He extold it—he praised the glorious sentiment till we preached directly against drunkenness, and then he fled—we have never seen him since. His name was Winslow. He liked the doctrine; but to hear a Universalist preacher condemn drunkenness so pointedly, was more than he could bear. So it is with the *wicked generally;* they love the doctrine, and love their sins both at once. How often do we hear men and boys talking of the 'unbounded love of God' with a *profane oath* in almost every sentence! The most *abandoned swearers*, and most *abominable characters* through the states, are frequently found advocating, amidst *shocking oaths* and *drunken revelry*, the 'liberal sentiment!' We should be sorry to state such things if we thought it *possible to be mistaken. But we cannot* be, *unless our very senses have deceived us.*" [Pages 14, 16, 17, 34, 38, 40, 44, 45, 51, 55, 63, 64, 80, 81, 84, 89, 97, 98, 123, 124.]

So much, reader, for the "practical tendency" of Universalism, and the influence it has upon the characters of "*ninety-nine out of a hundred*" of its professors! It is true the author of this testimony, since going back to the Universalists, has published to the world that he was affected with a mental derangement when he published his book! But how does he know but that he is deranged *now?* for if his *senses deceived him then*, he is no better off now, and has no stronger evidence to prove that he is now in his right mind! It is my solemn opinion, that if ever the man was crazy, it was at the time ("after being clean escaped from them that live in error") when he went back and had his name enrolled among a brotherhood of "Infidels," "Atheists," "gamblers," "drunkards," "scoffers at religion," "profane swearers," "Sabbath breakers," "debauchees," which he knew to be such from the evidence of his own "*senses*," the only testimony by which he now knows he has an existence!

Now friend Rogers, I bid you farewell;—I believe you to be an honest man, but wofully deceived; and hence I impute your contradictions, and incoherent, suicidal speculation, not to any lack on your part, either morally or intellectually, but to the sheer deficiency, and radical incoherency of the system you are endeavoring to defend! I have no feelings toward you but those of kindness and friendship, and should I ever see your face, you will, I trust, find me what I here profess to be, your friend and well wisher. May we all desire, *and seek after the* truth, that it may make us *free indeed!*

# THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

## DEMONSTRATED BY SCIENCE.*

The first step in attempting to establish, by science alone, the immortality of the soul, and consequently a future conscious state of existence, is to prove, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the soul is a *substantial entity.* If the soul can be demonstrated to be a *substance,* and not a vaguely-defined "mode of molecular motion," as claimed by materialists, then the most radical believer in the doctrine that "death ends all," must be so shaken in his faith as to admit in advance the soul's *possible* immortality. Nay, more. Prove the soul to be substantial, beyond the shadow of doubt, and the candid materialist will be logically driven to admit its immortality as a *reasonable probability,* since it is a universal axiom of science that no substance, however intangible to our senses, can be annihilated. Hence, the very first step in religious philosophy, in order to prove outside of the Bible that man shall live after the body dies, is to demonstrate the soul's *substantial existence here.* Can this be done? Can this intangible essence of our being be analyzed in the laboratory of reason, and, by bringing to bear upon it facts of science and proofs from Nature, be shown to possess an entitative character as really and truly as does the corporeal organism which it inhabits? We believe this can be done; and we will now, as briefly as possible, present the reader with what we regard as demonstrative evidence in favor of this central proposition.

The radical position first assumed and made public in *The Problem of Human Life,* that all the intangible forces, or so-called "modes of motion" in Nature, are real substances,—including light, heat, sound, magnetism, gravitation, electricity, &c.—we still regard as the entering wedge to the scientific proof of a future life, and as the archimedean lever of truth by which the world of atheistic materialism is to be overturned. The fact that this fundamental view of Nature's forces had hitherto escaped the attention of theologians and Christian scientists, accounts in a large measure for the unsatisfactory results of pulpit efforts and theological treatises in making sensible inroads into the spirit of skepticism, latent and blatant, which has always stood as a bulwark in the way of the spread of Christianity. Instead of massing Scriptural proofs in favor of the

* By A. Wilford Hall, author of *Universalism Against Itself, The Problem of Human Life,* Editor of *The Microcosm,* etc.

immortality of the soul, which none question and few heed, let every clergyman in the land from this time forward boldly take the view of Nature here outlined, and maintain with incontrovertible proofs that the invisible and intangible "forces" are as really substantial as are the corporeal bodies recognized by our senses, and, you may depend upon it, there will at once be opened to view a new world of substantial entities from which a flood of light will be poured into the skeptical mind. Demonstrate from the pulpit that these vaguely-defined nonentities of light, heat, sound, magnetism, electricity, and gravitation, are real substances,—things which have an entitative existence as literally and truly as have the food we eat, the water we drink, or the air we breathe,—and we can be certain that it will put the honest scientific skeptic to thinking as he never thought before. He will reason with himself when he listens to such proofs: "If these hitherto meaningless 'modes of motion' are in fact substantial entities, then why may not my soul, my intellect, my wondrous spirit, by which I recognize that *I am*, and by which I voluntarily move my body, direct my course in life, by which I make discoveries and construct ingenious inventions,—why may not this mysterious, indefinable something within me, which Materialism tells me is but a 'mode of molecular motion,' be also a substantial entity that must exist for weal or woe in a future life?" Such would be the undoubted drift of his thoughts under revolutionary reasoning like this. The question then is, and it is the question of questions in this age of profound research as relates to this discussion: Are there such proofs as those to which we have alluded, —clear, pointed, unmistakable proofs,—which can be poured from the pulpit and religious press into the millions of skeptical minds now in this land, demonstrating that every force of Nature must be, in the fitness and relation of things, a substantial entity? Let us see.

First of all, let us be explicit in the employment of terms. Without correct definitions of words the truth can never be arrived at. For example, *force* is not *motion*, neither is motion force, nor can they by the power of human ingenuity be successfully confounded. Many educated writers, apparently intelligent and discriminating, make no distinction in these two terms, using them interchangeably. This indiscriminate use of *force* and *motion* is proved to be the basis of materialistic philosophy by the declaration of Professor Haeckel, the head of that school in Germany, that the soul, or life-force which moves our bodies, is nothing but the complicated *motion* of the material molecules of the brain and other portions of a living organism. (*History of Creation*, vol. i., p. 199.) He thus makes the *motion* of the physical molecules the very *life-force* which produces the motion, thereby confounding the cause with the effect and the effect with the cause! Weaker or more self-contradictory reasoning in a *great* writer can scarcely be imagined, and can no where be found.

Yet this childish jumbling together of *motion* and the *force* which produces it constitutes the foundation of that materialistic system of philosophy which forms the chief argument of modern science against the immortality of the soul. Let this confusion be cleared up, and let the terms *force* and *motion* be shown to sustain toward each other the relation of *cause* and *effect*, and the corner-stone of materialism will have been swept away.

To accomplish this important result, and make it clear to the mind of every reader, the statement of a simple philosophical law and its proper amplification will suffice. The law is this: *The agent or force which moves a physical or inert body must of necessity be a substance of some kind, or the body could not and would not move.* We will now illustrate this law. The water-wheel, for example, is caused to move by the contact of the water with its buckets. Hence the *force* which produces this *motion* is the substantial *water*. The *motion* of the wheel surely is not identical with the *water* which causes the motion, though this is precisely what materialism teaches in regard to life as the force which moves our physical molecules. Neither is the *motion* of the water the *force* which moves the wheel, but it is the actual *contact* of the water itself with the buckets of the wheel. *Motion*, remember, is not substantial, and hence can not produce motion in any substance. *Motion* is but the *act* of a body in changing its position from a state of rest, and *necessarily ceases to exist* the moment the body ceases to move. All the *motions* of substantial bodies in the universe could never produce the effect of motion in any other body except by substantial contact with it. Motion alone effects nothing in mechanics. Hence motion, in every conceivable case, is but the insubstantial *effect* of the positive contact of a substantial *cause* with some substantial body. In this way the doctrine of the conservation of force may be true, and can be understood alone on the principle that all force is substantial, and must in the nature of things be conserved in the economy of God's universe, since no substance, however, it may change its form, can cease to exists.

It does not weaken our position in the least to object, here, that the water is not the force which moves the wheel, since gravity is the force which gives motion to the water and makes it effective. This very objection illustrates the beauty of our universal law, as just presented. The *water* could no more fall without the substantial contact of *gravity* to pull it down than could the *wheel* turn without the substantial contact of the *water*. Thus are forces linked together in the harmonious order of Nature, the motion of one substantial body being but the effect of the substantial contact of another which we call *force*. As the water could not act on the wheel, whatever might have been its motion, except by substantial contact, and as gravity could not act on the water to cause it to fall, except by substantial contact with its molecules, so the ultimate cause, which

gave to gravity its power to seize the water and pull it down upon the wheel, is solvable alone by postulating a substantial God as the primordial originator of this force, and the absolute dispenser of the laws of Nature by which her forces are controlled. The harmony of Nature and the fitness of things require an unbroken concatenation of all entities that exist or move, making them dependent upon each other even back to a primordial intelligent and self-existent causation, and without which the intellect of man is hopelessly swamped in attempting to solve the existence of one atom, or to account for the occurrence of a single phenomenon in the universe.

Our constant familiarity with such a substance as gross *water*, for example, in its contact with the gross *water-wheel*, by which the latter is caused to revolve, prevents our readily conceiving of water as the actual *force* which produces this motion. Materialistic scholasticism, so dominant in our text-books as the basis of all instruction in physics, has confused our minds upon this subject till we understand nothing, as "force" unless it be something that is not tangible, and consequently *something*, according to received science, that is not *something*, in any substantial sense of the term. Whereas true science must teach us that "force" may be as solid as iron or as intangible as gravitation, while the latter is none the less substantial because of its inconceivable attenuation and intangibility. To prove this, let us take the materialistic student one step farther in the upward gradation of force, from the gross water that moves the wheel toward the ideally scientific "force" of gravity that moves the water. Science does not hesitate to speak of *steam*, for example, as an actual "force" whenever it happens to forget itself, though it would not think of applying that term to so gross a substance as water, especially when discussing the mooted doctrine of the "conservation of force." Science would hardly discuss the "conservation" of *water*, since it distinctly teaches its absolute indestructibility. Yet *steam*, an acknowledged force, is nothing but *water* in a rarefied form, and is as really substantial, though invisible, as is the gross and ponderable water itself. If water in the form of steam is "force" when it drives the piston, so is water in its gross form when it turns the wheel! Professor Haeckel, while admitting steam to be a *force* would not think of confounding the *motion* of the piston with the *force* that drives it! Nor would he teach such a philosophical jumble of ideas and confusion of terms as that this force (steam) which causes the piston to move is but the insubstantial "mode of motion" thus produced, and that it ceases to exist as soon as the piston comes to rest! Yet he does teach that very thing in regard to the soul or life-force which moves our corporeal bodies; for he distinctly tells us, in many places in his books, that this *force* is but the *motion* which it produces, and that the *force ceases to exist with the cessation of the motion*, namely, at death! It is some satisfaction to know that even this distinguished materialistic philosopher

has sufficient lucidity at times to form a correct conception of the nature of "force," especially when it is dense enough and hot enough to *scald* him! But reason with him about the force of *gravity*, which accomplishes physical results analogous to those of steam, and because he cannot feel it with his hand, subject it to chemical tests, see it through his microscope, or recognize it in any other gross or sensuous way, he exclaims, "Oh, it is a *mode of motion!*" How convenient is this universal solution of philosophical problems which do not happen to adapt themselves to the physcial senses of advanced scientific thinkers, even to the wiping out of the substantial existence of their own souls and that of the God who made them!

Hence the necessity in the progress of scientific investigation, for a systematic and, if possible, successful assault upon one of the most plausible of all the so-called "modes of motion" in Nature, the *wave-theory of sound*. Christian philosophers and scientists have been slow to appreciate the value of this assault or even to comprehend its appropriateness in the solution of the problem of human life. But thank God its importance is beginning to be seen and felt by the religious world; and we believe it will grow till it will be regarded as the very corner-stone of the argument which assumes to prove from science the posibility of a future life, in opposition to the claims of scientific materialism. For example, and as an illustration of its bearing, could Professor Haeckel be made to believe that the wave-theory of sound was a scientific fallacy, and, as the only alternative, that sound must be a veritable substance, he would at once, as a logical and philosophical reasoner, be forced to renounce his materialistic view of the soul as but a "mode of molecular motion," and he would admit, as the only alternative, its substantial nature. Further, let him be convinced that the soul is a substantial *entity*, instead of an insubstantial *motion* of our corporeal atoms, and he would be compelled to renounce atheism, since it is just as easy to believe in a substantial but immaterial God who can think, feel, love, &c., as to believe in a substantial but incorporeal soul that can do the same things! Then with this change of base would vanish his hypothesis of, or necessity for, spontaneous generation, since the soul, as a substantial entity, being capable of moving our bodies and directing them to the creation of magnificent inventions and works of art, proves that a substantial God would be capable of creating the first living organism; and if the first, then Haeckel is too much of a logician to suppose with Darwin that God personally and miraculously created the first animal, breathed into it a substantial soul and mental power, and then abandoned his work, leaving Nature to develop as it might, or not develop at all, just as it happened. Hence, as the reader must see, the necessity of breaking down this prevailing materialistic fallacy, that everything in Nature is a "mode of motion" which can not be brought within the analysis of our senses, or demonstrated to be substantial by chemical tests. Hence,

therefore, the necessity of our exhaustive assault upon the wave-theory of sound.

Religious scientists who are so ready (without due reflection, we must insist,) to object to our attack on the wave-theory of sound as a foolish argument in favor of the substantial nature of the soul, never stop to think that if sound be really a mode of motion and not a substance, so must be all the other forces of Nature, including the life-force which moves our bodies. They little think that, by this short-sighted objection to our position on sound, they are actully playing into the hands of Haeckel and Huxley by helping them to prove the soul but a mode of molecular motion, thus keeping it in harmony with sound, light, heat, gravitation, and other natural forces and phenomena. Prove Tyndall to be right on sound, and you have more than half given up the scientific ship to Haeckel, by admitting that the soul is not a substance, but merely some kind of a process of molecular vibration! We beg, therefore, of Christian ministers and religious philosophers to reflect seriously before unceremoniously scouting our position on sound, especially as is too apt to be the case, without giving it very critical examination.

We assume, then, that demonstrative evidence of the substantial nature of the soul, by a series of incontrovertible proofs that Nature's forces are all substantial entities instead of modes of motion, is the entering wedge to the overthrow of scientific materialism and infidelity; and we insist that the time has come when these proofs should be driven home from the pulpit and the press by the mallet of logic, aided by the irresistible analogies of Nature, till every candid listener and reader shall feel and acknowledge their power. Let the preacher who desires to convert his skeptical hearers take up the study of science, not solely from the text-books, but also from Nature and common sense, and then, when he preaches against infidelity, let him take for his text the "electro-magnet," for example, instead of some isolated segment of a scripture verse, which infidels scout, and let him press home the marvelous fact that an actual *substance*, which science calls magnetic "force," and which none of our senses can recognize and no chemical test can determine, is passing from the magnetic poles, pouring through the most impervious bodies, and seizing a bar of inert steel, which it absolutely displaces and draws toward itself as if pulling it by tangible cords. Let him even take with him into the pulpit a common horseshoe magnet—one that he can buy for fifty cents—and a pane of ordinary window glass, and let him suspend a small bar of iron by a thread, in the presence of his congregation, holding the sheet of glass between the magnet and the bar so that his auditors may witness the action of the invisible magnetic streams as they pass through this impervious body and seize the bar as if nothing intervened, and he will present to every intelligent person present the most magnificent and unanswerable

scientific argument in favor of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul ever exhibited to man.

No matter if some of his congregation should object that this was not a sermon, but a scientific lecture. So much the better. Let us have a change. We need more true science mixed up with our sermons for the popular mind, and we need more texts quoted from God's book of Nature, if we would induce skeptical scientists and thoughtful men of the world to attend the church. As proof of this, look at the fact that in this very city, while our ablest divines are preaching their usual free sermons to a pitiful hundred listeners, Ingersoll is delivering his atheistic lectures to crowded audiences at a dollar a head, while hundreds go away for want even of standing-room. These are startling facts, sufficient to appall the Christian world, and make every believer in religion tremble for the future of the church. In what way can such a state of things be counteracted? We firmly believe that the only cure for it is for every clergyman in the land to reconstruct himself into a Christian scientist, and mix freely in his sermons scientific illustrations with the glorious gospel of the Son of God, and thus combine freely God's testimony in Nature with the written word, even if he has to take with him into his pulpit every Sabbath evening a miniature steam-engine, a magic lantern, and a complete electro-magnetic apparatus!

Let the minister who would convert his infidel friends, take a new departure, and demonstrate from science that entities exist all around us completely beyond the range of our corporeal senses; and consequently, judging from all the analogies in Nature, that the soul must also be an entity. Let him, as we have been trying to do here, insist upon the fact that, as the water-wheel could not turn without the *substantial* contact of the water, and as the piston could not move without the substantial contact of the steam (an acknowledged force), so the suspended iron bar could not, by any *possibility*, be drawn toward the magnet without the substantial contact of an actual entity connecting them together, notwithstanding this substance was so far above material conditions as to pass uninterruptedly through a sheet of glass as if nothing were in the way. Let him then defy the intellect of man to conceive of any essential difference between the three forces referred to, as to their substantial nature, except in degree of density and intangibility.

Finally, let him make intelligent application of these facts of science and analogies of Nature to that intangible force which moves the molecules and organs of our bodies, and according to every principle of logic and reason it will demonstrate the soul to be as truly a substance as is the water which moves the wheel, the steam which moves the piston, or the magnetic currents which move the iron bar, since they all accomplish similar corporeal results. In this manner can the soul of man be proved by science alone to be a substantial entity; and if substantial, then its indestructibility necessarily fol-

lows; and if indestructible, then its personal immortality can reasonably be established, since a substance involving thought, feeling, sensation and self-consciousness cannot, as such, cease to exist.

The objection, now in the reader's mind, that this view involves the immortality of the lower animals as well as that of man, will soon be briefly considered.

Thus far we have endeavored to lay a foundation in reason, science, and philosophy, by which the immortality of the soul could be shown to be clearly probable, independent of Scripture testimony. The first step, and a very important one, in our progress, has been established, namely, that the soul or vital force which animates and voluntarily or involuntarily moves our bodies, must be a *substantial entity*, though immaterial or incorporeal, yet as really and truly *substance* as is the bodily organism which it inhabits, animates, and moves.

We will now look after another important branch of the discussion, namely, the necessarily *organic* and *personal* nature of the soul or vital entity of our being. Without designing to refer to Scripture proof, we may well call attention to the rational and philosophical view taken by the apostle in speaking of the physical body as the "outer *man*," and of the soul, or vital being, as the "inner *man*." The superficial only are capable of denying entitative existence to the soul, on the ground that it is not subject to visible or tangible recognition. Materialistic philosophers who claim, par excellence, to reason logically upon this subject, deny entity to the only part of the man which does the thinking, feeling, loving, hoping, &c., because, forsooth, as they ask, Who ever saw a soul? Who ever handled a spirit? Who ever heard, or smelt, or tasted an intellect? Yet these philosophers gaze upon an inert mass of matter, and see it walk and smile; hear it talk, laugh, and sing; feel it grasp the hand and kiss the lips;—while all these evidences of a substantial but invisible controlling entity within the mass with them go for nothing, because this entity defies the observation of the senses, and does not possess material properties. These are the logicians who, regarding nothing as substantial save that which is material, are capable of conceiving the idea of a clock running and keeping time without weight, spring, or other substantial motive force. And this is the philosophy that would scout the existence of any such spring or weight, even while seeing the clock run and keep time, if, perchance, such motive force happened to be cunningly concealed in the case beyond the observation of their senses!

We have assumed as an axiomatic principle in science and philosophy, that no inert body can move itself or be moved without the contact of some substantial force, material or immaterial. With this fundamental law as our guide, we can not conceive of the soul, *or "inner* man," which moves and manipulates the outer or corpo*real body, as* anything but an entity,—a something as really substan-

tial, though invisible, as is the tangible and external organism it manipulates. If this be true, then it leads us another step, namely, to assume that this vital and mental entity within us is really an "inner *man*,"—nothing more nor less than an *incorporeal organism*, the exact counterpart of the physical structure, and that the corporeal or "outer man" sees because the "inner man," or the soul, looks out through the physical eyes as we look out through the lenses of a telescope.

Many physiological and psychological reasons swarm before us which go to prove beyond a doubt that the vital and mental part of man is as really an organized entity as is the body itself. No man, for example, has ever given the faintest shadow of an explanation of dreams, on the basis of materialism. If the soul, or vital being, consists simply of the physical motion of the molecules of the brain, then how do these vivid visions of real life, and of scenes oftentimes never experienced in waking hours, impress themselves upon the memory, when the will is quiescent and the physical energies are wrapped in slumber, so as to be almost imperishable? What other view of this sleepless soul-activity and its intelligent operations than that it is an incorporeal organism, will rationally account for its unmistakable vital and mental impressions? How is it possible for the psychical part of our being, even in our waking moments, to see the most delicate details of intricate machinery far better when the physical eyes are closed than with them open, if the soul has no eyes with which to make these involved and complex examinations? And if the soul has eyes, it has also ears, and brain, and fingers; and hence must be an organism. But this is only a minor and collateral consideration, going to prove the supposition of the organic nature of the soul. We have reasons for this view too strong to admit of doubt. We will now proceed to name a few of them.

How, for example, are the *bioplasts*—those infinitesimal workers which Dr. Beale sees through his powerful microscope weaving the tissues of the body, nerves, tendons, muscles, arteries, veins, &c.—how are they to work intelligently or systematically if there be no incorporeal structure as a pattern to guide and give direction to their physiological operations? These bioplasts are all alike, or at least are so nearly so that no shade of corporeal difference can be detected under the microscope between those that weave the muscles and those that spin the fibers of the nerves, tendons, veins and arteries. How can these same little artificers divide themselves off into gangs, and each, like beees in a hive under the general direction of their queen and the special impulse of their individual instincts, go about its own work and pursue it with unfailing precision till the task is done? Philosophers, in their histological researches, have reasoned themselves down to the visible performance of these apparently intelligent workers, as the last tangible link in the physiological chain and the innermost key to the problem of life; but here, with one

accord, the attempt at solution has been dropped, as involved in eternal mystery. But how simple the problem becomes when the vital and mental entity of our being, which alone gives motion to these workers, is looked upon as a veritable organism possessing incorporeal but substantial nerves, tendons, arteries, veins, and muscles, corresponding in all respects, except corporeality, with those of the physical body, or "outer man"! How simple and beautiful are these methodical and semi-intelligent operations of the bioplasts, each plying its shuttle in its own specific way, and thus composing a web of its own peculiar warp and woof, as adapted to that particular part of the corporeal structure! How satisfying, also, the explanatory fact that the reason why the workmen set to weaving an artery do not make a mistake and spin a nerve, is because these artisans of Nature are guided in their task by a substantial pattern, —an incorporeal artery of exactly the same form and outline as the one they are weaving, invisible though it be, and unrecognizable by our physical senses! What has there ever been suggested in science or philosophy that throws a ray of light upon this mystery of physiology, save the sublime hypothesis here assumed, that we have within the corporeal structure an incorporeal organism which is its exact counterpart, and which answers as the pattern and guide for all the manifold and multiform operations of the physical functions in building and repairing organic tissues?

In *The Problem of Human Life*, while exhaustively discussing this subject, reference is made to the fact that the leg of the salamander, as also of some other animals, if amputated, will be reproduced by growth, even to the minutest details of its veins, joints, nerves, and the color of its cuticle. How do the bioplasts of this little animal proceed in projecting or building out the tissues from the stump of the lost leg, so as to give form and continuity to the new nerves, muscles, tendons, arteries, veins, and bones, each in its proper relation and proportion, if there be no vital leg remaining attached to the stump, as the invisible guide for these physiological operations? Why do not the workmen mistake their task, and project another *tail* from this stump instead of a leg, if they have no pattern by which to work?

A certain worm—the *nais*—can be cut into several sections, each of which, if it contains one of this animal's vital centers, has been shown capable of producing the entire worm, by what is vaguely termed re-growth. This can only be explained, however, by supposing that the *vital entity* of this worm, in its complete though invisible outline, remains connected with each segment of the animal, as a guide to the deposition of corporeal substance by the working bioplasts. In a case like this we have to assume, as the only rational hypothesis, that the incorporeal organism of the *nais* is of great vital *density*, in order that it may thus be subdivided and still form *outline-patterns* for so many sections of this animal,—each incor-

poreal form retaining sufficient vital substance to guide the bioplasts in their work.

The same is true also, in the case of supernumerary fingers on the hands of infants which have been amputated, as recorded in physiological and surgical works. These fingers have been known to reproduce themselves by growth, even to the perfect joints, nails, &c. But what physiologist has ever attempted to give an explanation as to the manner in which re-growth accomplishes such results, that was satisfactory even to himself? Nothing ever written has thrown a ray of light upon this subject save the fact, as here given, that the child had a *vital hand* within the physical, and as literally and really substantial as is its corporeal counterpart; and hence, when the corporeal finger is severed, the vital but invisible finger still remains attached to the hand to guide the molecules of flesh and bone as they are pushed forward by the little army of bioplasts. Can physiologists form any intelligible guess as to why these tiny workers did not construct a toe on the hand of this child instead of a finger, except by aid of our hypothesis of an invisible, intangible, and incorporeal organism within every living creature?

As corroborative of this view, the soldier feels the fingers of a lost hand for months after amputation. A dog, too, has been known to make attempts to lick a lost foot. No solution of this admitted fact so well accords with these phenomena, or so readily explains them, as the existence of an incorporeal vital organism within the physical, and by means of which growth of parts, healing of wounds, sensation, food-assimilation, and all vital processes are carried on.

Then a consideration even stronger than these is brought to view, in the problem of inherited characters transmitted from father to son, from grandfather to grandson, and even from remote progenitors down through many generations. It is abundantly established that no inheritance of characters, mental or physical, can take place though the corporeal blood or flesh of a progenitor, since the united testimony of physiologists is that all the matter constituting our bodies changes several times during the period of an ordinary lifetime; and that not a particle of the substance composing the body of an infant remains with it when grown to maturity.

Many claim that this radical change and displacement of constituent matter occurs once in every seven years, though all agree that it occurs more than once from infancy to old age. How, then, can a remnant of blood or other corporeal substance of the father be transmitted to the son, to say nothing of descending through a line of many generations? Hence, all transmissions of characters, organic as well as mental, must take place through a substantial structure that is not corporeal or subject to this universal law of displacement and substitution. We have not room here to elaborate this conclusive argument; but we regard it as entirely demonstrative that the life-germ transferred to the child by father and mother—that in-

corporeal entity which constitutes the specific outline, and which guides the deposition of physical particles in order to the maintenance and perpetuity of the specific forms of animals—is that enduring and substantial organism which, though invisible and intangible, descends from father to son, and from generation to generation, and by means of which alone heredity does its work.

This is beautifully illustrated and confirmed in the admitted fact that the ovule from which every living creature develops—about the 125th of an inch in diameter—is exactly alike in all animals, from man down. Darwin declares repeatedly that the "*ovule* of the man, the horse, and the dog, differ in no respect." Hence, by universal consent something not physical or corporeal within these ovules must represent the actual difference which occurs as the embryos of the different species develop, otherwise there is no reason why a cow should not produce a colt, or a deer give birth to a young tiger, since their ovules "differ in no respect." Believers in the physical basis of heredity and descent, such as Mr. Darwin, Prof. Huxley, and other materialists, as well as those professed Christian ministers who ignore the incorporeal organism of the soul as here maintained, can give no explanation of the (to them) astounding mystery that diverse species develop from ovules, and even early embryos, exactly alike. It is only by postulating, as here done, an incorporeal and specific entity within the physical ovules of all animals, by which the future being takes its outline and assumes its mental and vital characteristics as a race, that any solution whatever can be given of the mysteries of inheritance or the observed stability of the species.

If the "inner man" or vital being does not possess organic *features*, such as mouth, nose, eyes, cheeks, chin, forehead, &c., then how are the features of a grandfather to be transmitted to the grandson by atavism, since every particle of the material constituting those features is lost and replaced by other materials every seven years? Not a single blood-corpuscle of the grandsire ever reaches the grandson. Will materialistic philosophers give some sort of an explanation of this matter by the laws of corporeal descent, or else frankly admit the soul to be an organized entity, and not the mere mode of molecular motion which their moribund theory of human existence teaches? With the view here maintained, all variations of organic beings must first occur in the incorporeal organism, or otherwise they could not produce a variation in the physical structure. These variations take place as a result of the mental and vital perturbations of the mother during gestation. Mr. Darwin admits that it is impossible to give a satisfactory explanation of these slight modifications, which, as he claims, lead to the transmutation of species. We not only furnish him here with the true cause of organic variations, but with the true reason which confines each species permanently within the limits of its normal structure as a race of beings, with *the demonstrable* certainty that all those physiological phenomena

depend for their occurrence on the fact of the duality of every living creature.

How beautifully, then, is this solution in keeping with the well known fact that the child resembles the father and mother equally, both in its physical shape and its mental qualities! Yet not a thousandth part of its corporeal being at birth has come from the father,—nearly the entire physical entity being the product of the mother, through transferrence of her bioplasts and blood-corpuscles to its body. If inheritance were in any degree the result of physical transmission, every child or young animal should resemble the mother a thousand times more than the father. Thus we have proof upon proof that the vital and mental part of every living creature is the essential part,—the real part,—and constitutes from the start an organism which maintains the form of the specific race to which the being belongs, and that it is this which causes development, and forms the pattern or guide by which the different parts of organic beings can grow or be produced at all. Leave out of view this vital and mental organism, and consider, as does Darwin, Haeckel, and Huxley, only the physical or material part of organic beings, thus making the vital and mental part insubstantial, or only the *motion* of the corporeal molecules "placed together in a most varied manner," as Haeckel expresses it, and no wonder existence as well as inheritance becomes a mystery to which Mr. Darwin begs for any kind of an explanation, however imperfect, agreeing in advance to be satisfied therewith!

We have thus given a solution which is not only rational and consistent with various classes of observed phenomena and facts of science, solving at once and completely difficulties which otherwise are hopelessly inexplicable, but a solution of life which is in itself infinitely satisfactory, as it gives us not only a firm basis for intellectual improvement here, but a substantial hope of life and immortality hereafter.

It only remains, then, to complete this harmonious explanation, that we give a rational view of the true difference which exists between the human race and the lower order of animals, and a probable reason why the latter will not possess conscious immortality, though possessing here a vital and mental organism.

On the supposition that all life and mentality came from God as a substantial part of himself,—an atom, so to speak, from the universal fountain of life and mind,—it would be but a reasonable view to suppose that all these atoms of life and mind, which make up the vital and mental organisms of living creatures, must return again at death to the original fountain, and reconstitute an infinitesimal fraction of the vital and mental being of the Deity, as before. Such would seem to be a rational view, at least with reference to lower animals, whose mental aspirations are incapable of grasping the idea of a conscious state of existence beyond the present. But this supposi-

tion is evidently modified in the case of a human being, who, as facts seem to warrant, has had originally implanted by the Creator, and as an ineradicable part of his mental and vital organism, a longing sense of a future life, even down to the lowest and most uncultured tribes of savage men. The evidence from science alone, as here abundantly given, that this "inner man" is not only a substantial *entity* but a real *organism*, is a demonstrative proof that such substantial organism must have been a direct and primordial emanation from a prior fountain of intelligence and vitality, which is, by common consent, designated as the God or Creator of the universe. This simple and harmonious fact of an incorporeal vital and mental *organism*, thus proved by science, not only annihilates materialism, but demonstrates the existence of a God, since admittedly no such incorporeal vital and mental entity could have come into existence from inert matter by any law or principle known to materialistic philosophy. Then if an intelligent God did really create and give to man this vital and mental entity, with the additional endowment, above all other races of organic life, of an aspiration for a future state of existence, it becomes scientific proof as strong as holy writ that such a state of being is not only possible but an absolute verity, since an intelligent God, capable of thus making us, would not have so endowed us, and so indelibly stamped upon our spiritual organism a longing sense for a future conscious existence, with no possibility in the universe for its realization and enjoyment.

Scientifically considered, we feel satisfied that the true difference between man and beast, and the original cause of that difference, as given in *The Problem of Human Life*, and here reproduced, is the only correct and reasonable solution of the problem of a future existence. If the beast had a mental constitution that gave it the slightest glimpse into a future state of being, or that caused the faintest desire for such a continuance of conscious existence, we should believe, with John Wesley, Joseph Cook, and other great and careful thinkers, in the possible—nay, probable—future life of such animal tribes as possessed these aspirations. But as animals below man are not constitutionally capable of such anticipatory thoughts, their lives undoubtedly serve the purpose originally intended by the Creator in placing them on the earth, where they have supplied their wants during the brief period of this temporary existence.

How simple and beautiful, then, is the sublime thought that the mental and vital substance which animated and inspired these myriads of lower organisms, as fast as they die is reabsorbed into the primordial fountain of life and mentality from which they were originally supplied, without an atom of such incorporeal entity being lost or annihilated!

But the same analogical reasoning which would convince us that the beast will not retain an individual and conscious identity after *the death of* its body, proves also that man will so survive his earth-

ly existence. It is an inbred principle of his constitution and a part of his nature—even in the lowest savage—to long for and anticipate a life beyond the present; and it is an unanswerable fact that the more uncultured a people are, the more personal, literal, and entitative do these pictures of a future state become, even to the most vivid visions of hunting-scenes which pass before the mind of the unlettered savage, and which no argument of the atheist or materialist can ever eradicate from his belief, or even tend to weaken. If this general idea of a hereafter for man be not an original implantation from the Almighty, then tell me, ye skeptical philosophers, please, why the ideal of the life of the future approaches more nearly to the real life of the present, becomming more and more a palpable fact to the longing heart as the mental and vital stream of humanity is traced back to its primordial source?

The solution we have given,—and the only one that affords any satisfaction to the mind,—is, that this longing anticipation individualizes the human animal as a race,—not only making it a subject of personal immortality in a future state, but demonstrating the original design of the Creative Will to be that man was destined from the first to be a denizen of two worlds; and that the present, in the All-wise counsels of the universe, was to be but the temporary school as a preparatory step for a final state of conscious personality.

As certain as living creatures are the original products of a personal supervising intelligence, who knew what he was about in placing man and the countless grades of lower organisms upon this planet, instead of tracing their origin to a senseless and mindless law of Natural Selection, just so certain does this implanted aspiration for immortality in man prove that there is in the realms of this creative intelligence a state or condition somewhere with which to gratify such longing, or else the very implantation would be an exhibition of supreme mockery and infinite trifling.

# DOES DEATH END ALL? No. 1.

No other question so deeply interests mankind individually and personally as the one propounded above; and no intelligent man or woman of the countless millions who have lived and died upon this earth has approached the final change without seriously asking the same question. For thousands of years it has been one of the chief efforts of philosophers and religionists of all schools to give a definite and satisfactory answer to this question, and to establish such a system of intelligent belief, based on such an array of facts, or other rational considerations as would convince persons of ordinary intellects that there is as much a real hereafter to humanity beyond the night of death, as there is a real to-morrow beyond the setting of the physical sun of to-day. It scarcely needs to be said that all efforts to such an end thus far have failed—not wholly, but to the extent of absolute satisfaction on the part of an inquiring mind.

Could we *know* positively that when this body dies that which animates it will immediately awaken in another life with a spiritual body, clothed upon with spiritual vestments, and surrounded by a real spiritual environment as tangible to the soul as is the present environment to the bodily senses, it is manifest that the present state of existence would be a very different thing to that which it now is. With such a future before us clearly defined and rationally assured upon such unimpeachable evidence as to defy reasonable doubt, man could walk erect and smile in the midst of the most exasperating vexations and disappointments, and be enabled thereby to meet the trials and discouragements of life with a serenity that would tend to allay the very storms which they generate and which would otherwise lead to disaster and ruin.

Is it possible in this life to acquire such a practical assurance of a real existence beyond the present, independent of the ordinary channels of religious faith, as to make the future state a matter of business consideration, as we would anticipate the coming spring-time and prepare for its duties and enjoyments when this winter of our discontent shall have passed away?

We believe that such a degree of assurance on the part of every intelligent man and woman, is the chief and legitimate inheritance which the Creator of our bodies and the Father of our spirits originally intended for us to possess and enjoy here.

We do not claim that the same kind of evidence can be given of a *future life* as we enjoy of the rising of to-morrow's sun, because the

latter is the result of experience in our often seeing the sun to rise and set, and in witnessing the close of one day and the dawn of another. But even personal experience, oft-repeated, is no stronger or more convincing evidence than that which depends upon other kinds of testimony, such as the unquestioned voice of concurrent circumstances coupled with various other rational considerations. For example, we met a friend whom we have well known for years on Broadway yesterday, and conversed with him for several minutes. Of this we have the evidence of our senses, as well as of years of previous acquaintance. But in point of fact we are not nearly so sure that we met, or saw, or conversed with this friend as we are that there is a real city called *London* which has existed for hundreds of years on the other side of the Atlantic ocean, though we never saw that city and only know of its existence by rational consideration outside of personal experience. The "fool" concludes that there is no God because he never saw one. Yet if God should actually present himself to the gaze of such an atheist he would be more apt to conclude that he had been momentarily out of his senses that to believe that he had seen the Almighty, unless he were really too big a "fool" to reason soundly. So we might be mistaken about having met our friend on Broadway because others have been so mistaken before from momentary derangement of the sight or aberration of the mental faculties; but we cannot be mistaken about the city of London, because its existence in our convictions depends upon so many concurrent facts, evidences, and circumstances that we are necessarily as certain of such a city beyond the Atlantic as we are certain of our own consciousness, which is the only basis of all other classes of knowledge.

We hold, therefore, that the want of personal experience with reference to a future state of conscious being for man does not necessarily detract from the certainty of the evidence in its favor, or the undoubted assurance which we may rationally entertain of such a hereafter for humanity.

We believe that the time has at last arrived in the world's philosophical and scientific progress when man may absolutely *know*, in a most important sense of that word, that the present life is not, in the very nature of things, all there is of us or for us; and that the Power that created and placed us here, with the countless evidences of intelligent design manifest in our marvelous vital, mental, and physical organizations, and everywhere witnessed in our relations to the environment, contemplated more by such existence than to mock human intelligence and to stultify all ideas of Divine wisdom which man is capable of forming. We purpose, therefore, from time to time, as opportunity offers, to present brief articles upon this most pregnant theme, of which this forms the introduction.

# DOES DEATH END ALL? No. 2.

In this paper we assume the existence of God as the Creator of the universe, and shall base or arguments for a future conscious existence for man upon that fact the same as if it had been demonstrated beyond all question. In our next, we will undertake to prove the existence of God so demonstrably as to leave no room for doubt in a reasonable mind.

Assuming that God exists and that he created this world with all it contains, we must, in the nature of things, conceive of such Creator as a personal intelligence of infinite capabilities. To have created such a world, with such evidences of design and such beautiful adaptions of means to ends, with so many results everywhere seen in Nature as the effect of complex laws, forces, and processes interacting to accomplish such results, proves to a rational mind that the being, or principle, or power which so originated these processes, designed these adaptations, ordained these laws, and put into operation these forces must be an infinite *intelligence*, a real personality like unto man in point of conscious, entitative being, but incomprehensibly beyond man in the extent of his knowledge, and the sweep of his power in executing his conceptions. That such a being must think, plan, resolve, and reason, cannot be doubted except to fall back upon an utter denial of his existence as the creative power which originated the world with its beauty, order, and utility. If he thinks, reasons, plans, and purposes in carrying out his works of creation, he must exist outside of a physical or corporeal organism, and thus exist a real conscious, personal, and spiritual intelligence. This fact or truth alone, if it be an indisputable fact or truth, settles the question of materialism and sweeps its very foundation from existence. Materialists are of necessity compelled to be Atheists. They deny the fact that man exists at all, except as a purely material organism, and insist that all manifestations of vitality or mentality are mere phenomena of motion—the result of molecular action. What causes this molecular action, they do not pretend to explain or even to guess. Here is the chasm which bars their further progress. But, however unsatisfactory and self-contradictory such a view may be even to the minds of avowed materialists, they prefer to adopt its incoherencies and absurdities rather that to yield their convictions to the greater difficulty, as they conceive, of believing that man is a two-fold entity, having an immaterial personality as *well as material*, visible, tangible form,—the one the counterpart of

the other. To admit the real existence of the soul or spiritual entity of man, as one half of his being, is to admit the existence of something entitative beyond the recognition of any of our senses, and beyond the possibility of any scientific test. Hence, the substantial nature of the psychical half of man's being is repudiated as inconceivable, though the very philosophers who thus stumble at such an impossible conception, teach, as scientific, that mental and vital phenomena are the effect of the motions of our physical molecules, and consequently that these molecules move without any substantial or even conceivable cause. To teach, therefore, that what we call life, mind, soul, or spirit, is the result of such motions precludes the possibility of attributing such motions to life or mentality as their cause. Nothing can be both the cause and effect of itself. Materialists thus see movements in all living organisms for which they cannot find a visible or tangible cause. To avoid absolute trouble and discomfiture, they trace such manifest organic motions back to the invisible movements of the invisible molecules of matter, apparently thinking that because these are so far out of sight or beyond the limits of our vision the difficulty is necessarily solved. This is like the pursued ostrich which, as a final resort, thrusts its head into the sand, hoping that by shutting out the light to evade the hunter! But materialists will find, in thus closing their own eyes by assuming an invisible motion of particles too minute to be seen even by aid of the microscope, that they do not begin to solve the difficulty, but only put it one stage farther off. The real cause of such molecular motion, which they assume to be the cause of organic action, remains to be accounted for as much as the visible motions of our hands and feet. Nothing can move, or be moved, without actual contact with substance of some kind. This is a truism, when properly grasped, so axiomatic in the very nature of things that it defies even an atheist of the most materialistic convictions to doubt it. Yet its admission precludes the very fundamental conception of materialistic philosophy; for the molecular motion which, as materialism teaches, causes life, must result from the actual contact of some real substance with such molecules still finer than material atoms, in order to cause their motions and thus cause their vital effect; since no merely physical body, however minute, can move of itself. Simple matter being inert, has no self-moving power. The materialist superficially answers that a stone falls of itself, and a piece of iron moves toward the poles of a magnet of itself, without the contact of any other substance. What shallow philosophy! Let all who imagine that such childish logic can furnish a solution to these mysteries of life and mentality, read the second and seventh chapters of the "*Problem of Human Life*," and they will find that the forces of gravitation and magnetism furnish the most singular and startling proofs of the existence of substantial entities entirely beyond the range of physical or material conditions and outside of

the corporeal realm. A stone could not fall or move toward the earth, nor could an armature move toward the poles of a magnet without the agency of a connecting, invisible, and intangible substance drawing the two together. To conceive of such a possibility would be like conceiving of the pulling of a boat to the shore from the middle of the stream without some connecting substance, as a cord, with which to pull it. People are beginning to wake up to this revolutionary view of substance and matter, and to the rational fact, when the idea is once suggested, that every force of Nature is as much a real substance, though not necessarily material, as are the visible and tangible bodies upon which such forces act.

Thus materialistic philosophers, in denying the immaterial part of man as a substantial entity, are forced into a chasm of atheism and thus compelled to deny the existence of an intelligent Creator, since it is manifest to any one who reasons, that no Creator could exist and produce works of beauty and utility, or in fact do anything, unless He were a real substantial being—a veritable, intelligent personality. To deny his entitative existence, because we cannot see Him or recognize Him by our organic senses, is as unwarranted as to deny the all-pervading presence of electricity because it is invisible. We know, however, that electricity exists because of its manifestations; and we know that man exists in a higher sense than his physical organism from what he does, and from what his material body *per se*, could not do— since such a body, without an invisible intangible entity within, could do nothing. So we know that an intelligent God exists from his manifestations. Hence, the vain and self-contradictory efforts of materialistic philosophers to account for the origin of the visible universe from primeval star-dust, while the star-dust itself, with its processes of reconstruction into worlds remains unexplained! Hence the futility of trying to explain the operations of mentality, feeling, consciousness, by the motions of our material molecules, while no cause can be assigned or even imagined for such molecular motion! Hence the unwisdom of attempting to explain (!) the origin of life by spontaneous generation without an intelligent generator having life to infuse, and through the blind action of laws which never had a lawgiver! Hence, the presumption in essaying to unriddle the mysteries of man's being by assuming his development from the monkey, the reptile, the fish, and the protozoan, through natural selection and survival of the fittest, by a system of logic which necessarily proves that every fish that swims contains the primordial embryonic soul of a Darwin, and that every moneron that slimes the bottom of the sea incloses in its diminutive pellet of albumen the intellect, in a condensed form, of a Sir Isaac Newton!

Notwithstanding this scheme of development of the physical system of the world from an uncaused patch of nebulous star-dust *involves the* inexplicable difficulty of myriads of intelligent changes,

processes, formations, and adaptations of means to ends;—notwithstanding still vaster myriads of unquestioned evidence of intelligent design attend the countless changes which must have occurred in evolving an Anglo-Saxon Statesman from a horned-toad, yet our model German scientist and our accomplished English philosopher prefer their multitudinous absurdities and their endless abrupt terminations in effects without causes, to the consistent and satisfying admission of an intelligent personal Creator, which, though involving one great mystery, is an infinite solution of all problems both of time and eternity. The proof of the existence of such a God, even to as confirmed a materialist as Prof. Haeckel, would, were he honest, put an end to his materialism—and with it to his vain advocacy of spontaneous generation and subsequent evolution. That consistent scientist would say, Why; if there be an intelligent personal God, able to create at all, why not let Him do the whole work of creation as well as a small part of it, as supposed by Darwin? Why, he would say, make the *first* simple form and then retire forever from the work of creation? "Nonsense!" exclaims the philosopher of Jena University, and we respond Amen! Hence, Haeckel is an atheist by force of logical necessity, if evolution be accepted, and in so announcing himself he sets a worthy example to hundreds of gospel ministers including our greatest oratorical lights, who to-day, by advocating theistic evolution, would at once step down and out of their pulpits and avow themselves atheists, but for the inconsistency which they have imbibed from their master—Charles Darwin.

We can only conclude, therefore, that the existence of an intelligent God, as a substantial, personal entity without a physical organism, would be the climax of proof to a consistent thinker that man must also possess a substantial, personal, and organized entity in addition to his physical and tangible structure. And if such incorporeal personality really exists within this mortal body, what can such entity be designed for, as the work of the incorporeal substantial Deity, but to exist with Him in a psychical realm after its temporary sojourn on this physical earth is accomplished? That an intelligent, personal, incorporeal God exists, and can act and work, and think, and love, demonstrates that an incorporeal human personality can also exist in the same spiritual realm thus adapted to God as His habitation. No possible answer can be made to this proposition. The final conclusion then is, that as God made us with this entitative personality constituted of immaterial substance in addition to our corporeal bodies, and with mental and spiritual capabilities for the conception of His own incorporeal existence, with a longing desire to continue our own existence with Him eternally, it must therefore be accepted as conclusive evidence that such a God creating us with such evident design in our dual structure and being, and with such longing aspirations and capabilities for eternal enjoy-

ment, must have originally designed us for such future state of existence.

The proof, therefore, of man's immortality—the absolute demonstration of it, in fact—may be considered complete wherever the existence of a personal, intelligent God shall have been demonstrated. A man may therefore lift his hand toward heaven and, with glowing confidence, asseverate before all men: If God lives, then I shall live also! If God made me, then I am here for a purpose; and that purpose cannot be satisfied with this ephemeral existence! But if there be no God to have placed me here, then I am here by chance, without a purpose, and consequently *Death ends all!*

# DOES DEATH END ALL? No. 3.

We now consider the question—is there a living, intelligent, personal God, the framer of our bodies, and the giver of our spirits? Last month we assumed his existence as the basis of our arguments in favor of man's conscious existence after death, and reached what we thought, and still think, to be the only rational conclusion, namely, that if there be such an intelligent personality who can exist outside of a corporeal organism; invisible and intangible to our physical senses, who can think, and plan, and work; then materialism in all its forms breaks down, and man may regard his own future, conscious, personal existence as demonstrably established. Is there, then, such a being as we call God, the Author, Creator, and First Cause of the visible and invisible universe? If so, how can we prove it? How can the absolute presence in Nature of such an invisible, controlling power, which plans her adaptations and moves her forces to their execution, be demonstrated?

Before the theory of evolution had been framed by Mr. Darwin, and carried out by Prof. Haeckel to its legitimate, materialistic, and logical conclusion—the origin of life by spontaneous generation—there was no rational, or even supposable, excuse for denying the existence of a personal God, as the Creator and preserver of the universe. To assume that the countless, ingenious designs in Nature everywhere visible, with the innumerable intelligent adaptations of means to ends (presenting the same evidences of careful thought and study as are seen in a complex machine invented and worked out by man) could have been the result of blind *chance*, was simply ridiculous; and to a logical mind, however inclined to be skeptical, was sufficient alone to break down the atheistic hypothesis. But, with the advent of evolution, as presented and worked out by Mr. Darwin, though it was supposed to weaken, or even to break down the Bible account of creation, the atheistic view received even a severer shock; for in it a personal intelligent Creator was necessarily assumed to exist in order to conceive, plan and construct the first few simple beings, out of which the entire animal kingdom was to be evolved by natural selection and survival of the fittest.

Mr. Darwin's "Creator," who was necessarily assumed to have formed these primeval parents of the entire animal kingdom, was thus wiser, more intelligent, and more skillful than any God ever claimed to exist by Christian or heathen philosopher; for these

primeval parents—these tiny worms, or monera—were so ingeniously constructed, physically, vitally and mentally, as to embody within them the actual germ-life, germ-organism, and germ-mentality of all animals that have ever since lived—including the human family. What comparison does the Christian's God hold to such a god for infinitude of capability? None whatever. It was considered enough for the God of the Bible to create the parents of each species with inherent power to transmit their mental and physical peculiarities to their own specific descendants. But the "Creator" of Darwinism gives to a worm the intrinsic power to supply body, soul and intellect, not only to its own species but to a million dissimilar and diversified races, all higher than itself! Darwinians ought to be ready and willing to believe, if necessary, in a score of gods equal in power and intelligence to the God of the Bible, instead of being skeptical; for what would they all amount to, compared to the God who could do what Darwin's assumed "Creator" did, if his theory be true? It is like comparing a *Howe*, who could invent a sewing-machine, and then establish machinery for reproducing other instruments of the same kind, to the inventor who could originate a mere wheel so ingenious and wonderful, and which would embody such mechanical laws and principles that it could, without any further aid from the inventor, turn out in succession, not only all kinds of wheels, but wagons, railroad cars, steam-engines, printing-presses, clocks, watches, looms, sewing-machines, and all other mechanical contrivances now in use by man! Such an inventor compares with a Howe as Darwin's God does with the infinite God of the Bible! Think of it, ye atheists!

But this fatal blow at atheism was short-lived; for the idea of a God personally creating a worm, and then retiring forever from the world, and from all care as to how that worm might chance to develop, or whether man should ever exist at all or not, was too preposterous a system for the advanced scientific thinkers of Europe, especially in Germany; and hence, to escape the consequences of a real, living, personal God—which Darwin's theory involved *par excellence*—evolution was carried back to its legitimate basis of a spontaneous generation of the first animal as the start of future development. Of course this was supposed to rid the universe of God entirely, and thus to relieve Darwin's system of development of its only unscientific impediment; for if simple, uncaused, and mindless laws of Nature were capable of spontaneously generating a living, thinking, organic being, without the previous existence either of life or mind in the universe, then, plainly, the same laws would be all-sufficient for carrying on the various processes of development from such being to all other grades of intelligence, even up to the intellect of a Newton or a Milton. Then the system of development, as claimed by Prof. Haeckel, with such a spontaneous origin of life, would be complete, as the connecting link, bridging the hiatus between Kant's system

of cosmogony from primeval star-dust, and Darwin's law of development, by natural selection and survival of the fittest.

But the German naturalist who invented this spontaneous substitute for an intelligent Creator, as well as the little albuminous moneron thus brought into being, involved the system of development in even a worse difficulty than to have left it where it was, with a personal God as the Creator of the first moneron, as Darwin was forced to do; for manifestly a law of Nature, or system of laws and forces, which could design and then execute the incomprehensibly complex moneron (as shown so fully in the "*Problem of Human Life*"), must possess mentality and inventive intelligence far surpassing the inventive ability of the scientist who originated this spontaneous solution of the problem. And in what would such an intelligent, inventive system of intangible and invisible laws differ from Darwin's intangible, invisible, and personal creative intelligence, which we understand and designate by the term "God?" Clearly, there is no difference at all save in the name, and "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet;" while an intelligent God under the more scientific appellation of the Laws of Nature would be none the less a real, personal Creator, who might act by these very forces and processes of His own ordaining.

But granting that such intelligent results were thus brought about by simple laws of Nature; who enacted these laws and ordained these wonderful forces, so ingenious and powerful as to be capable of taking a little lifeless dirt and organizing it into a living, thinking, volitional being, whose marvelous complexity and adaptation of parts to wants and uses defy the wisdom of man to comprehend, much more to imitate? This is true even of the tangible, organic structure without reference to the incomparably more mysterious part—the incorporeal entity, the vital and mental organism within the material form—which moves and gives direction to the physical being. That such intelligent laws could exist from eternity without enactment, and with no one to enforce them to the accomplishment of such marvelous results as the organizing of living creatures, at one sweep annihilates the chief objection to the existence of a personal God who is assumed to *be* without having been *created*. We assume only an axiomatic truth, which any candid skeptic must admit, that no *intelligent result* can occur without an *intelligent cause*, any more than the motion of a body can change its direction without adequate counteracting force. Then, plainly, the creation of a living, thinking, voluntary being—even by what we call spontaneous generation—demonstrates previous intelligence, life and will-power in the cause of such creation, whether we call it a self-existent law of Nature, or a self-existent, personal God. Thus, the scientific atheist of this advanced school of evolution, is forced to admit the existence of an intelligent Creator, the same as was Mr. Darwin; only the former admits it under the guise of natural laws

and forces which have all the intelligence, will-power and ingenuity which an ardent Christian ascribes to the Deity he professes to worship.

But after Prof. Haeckel had thus unwittingly demonstrated the necessity for an intelligent God, under the *nom de plume* of law, who created the first moneron, he goes on just as did Darwin, and supposes, of course, that these self-existing, intelligent laws were so ingenious as to construct this "primeval parent of all other organisms," with the absolute, intrinsic germ-life and germ-mentality of all subsequent species and races of animals, including man. Thus, his admission of these intelligent creative laws, as just shown in the case of Darwin's "Creator" of the "first simple forms," involves a God far surpassing in intelligence the God of the Bible; and consequently his is equally fatal to the atheistic hypothesis with the forced admission of Mr. Darwin. But if to avoid this destructive blow at atheism Prof. Haeckel should unreasonably deny any will-power, choice, or intelligence on the part of the laws which so intelligently organized his "primeval parent," then why are not these same universal, self-existent laws of Nature still at work, and all the time at work, creating other simple animals, and thus filling earth, air, and ocean with innumerable varieties of spontaneously generated creatures? On Darwin's assumption of an intelligent God as the "Creator of the first simple beings," there was reason for His ceasing from work by voluntary choice. Christians in this way, also, can account for the absence of continual new creations, by the same voluntary decision on the part of an all-wise Creator. But Haeckel has no such mode of escape for his universal and mindless but intelligently-acting laws. Similar creations to that of the first moneron should be occurring all the time, unless these laws are a real God, with the ingenuity to create one such marvelous "primeval parent" and the will-power then to cease work as did the God of the Bible or the "Creator" of Darwinism. The fact that but *one* such "spontaneous generation" has ever occurred in the world's history, which Haeckel distinctly teaches, as quoted in the "*Problem of Human Life*," is proof positive that the universal laws and forces which did that intelligent work must constitute a veritable and intelligent God, to the total discomfiture of atheism. Thus Haeckel's attempt to rid the universe of a living God stultifies itself by substituting therefor an intelligent Deity under a false title who, like the "Creator" of Darwin's system, as far surpasses the ability of the God of the Bible as the intellect of a Humboldt surpasses the mental powers of a moneron.

But after Haeckel has thus stultified himself, and incontinently wiped out atheism, it is pitiable in the extreme to watch his efforts at belittling this "primeval parent of all other organisms" so as to reduce it almost to lifeless matter in the absence of visible organs, hoping thereby to make it such a very trifling little affair, that mindless laws of Nature might be able to produce it without any assis-

tance from an intelligent God! We have replied to this puerile effort of that great German philosopher in the seventh chapter of the "*Problem*," and shown that the fact of its possessing all the functions of life, such as food-assimilation, growth, reproduction by self-division, voluntary motion, etc., makes its organism vastly more wonderful and inexplicable by the very invisibility of its organs under the microscope, since the most complex organism must absolutely be present, or the organic functions could not be so beautifully carried on.

We have thus demonstrated the existence of an uncreated, intelligent God by using the strongest effort at disproving His existence ever made, and by the ablest atheist living. The creation of the first animal out of inorganic matter with its complex organism, vital functions, mental powers, voluntary instincts, and the marvelous design, adjustment of parts, and adaptation of functions to ends and uses, need only to be elaborated, and atheism can find no possible resting-place in the mind of any one who is capable of the least consecutive or logical thought.

Evidences of the same intelligent design and inventive skill can be seen everywhere in Nature, with the additional and crowning proof of an intelligent creative power in the display of *artistic taste*, which can have no possible use except to gratify a love for the beautiful, and which could not have originated except by mental effort and as the product of a high order of intelligence, since chance is totally out of the question. These displays of artistic taste and skill can be found under conditions and in forms which render explanation entirely impossible either by appeal to natural selection or sexual selection—the only two laws claimed as in any way accounting for the intelligent adaptation of parts to uses or the artistic adornment of birds and other animals. When any peculiarity of animal structure, form, or color, is not serviceable to its possessor in the struggle for life, it is admittedly outside of evolution by survival of the fittest, since Darwin, Haeckel, and all writers admit that natural selection can only produce forms, colors, designs, and patterns that are of use to the being thus constructed and ornamented. But they claim that sexual selection will account in these respects for what natural selection fails to explain. Then, if numerous beautiful designs and patterns of the most brilliant tints and artistic symmetry of figure can be found where they are not only of no use to the beings possessing them, and entirely beyond the possibility of development by sexual choice from generation to generation, as required by the theory, then they must be admitted to be the product of a creative intelligence above, and independent of, Nature in their original formation. We gave an abundance of evidence of the existence of just such displays of inventive skill and artistic taste in the seventh chapter of the "*Problem of Human Life*," where they were confessedly outside of and entirely beyond both natural and sexual selection, and, consequently,

must have been the product of an intellect like our own, but of infinite variety and expansion; since, as we showed, without intelligence and artistic taste, they could not have come into existence. Take, for example, the beautiful tints and exquisite patterns in the feathers of birds that are so small as to be impossible to have been seen and selected in pairing (to which Darwin attributes all sexual selection) since we can only see them by the aid of the microscope. These arrangements of shadings, tints, and geometrical lines exhibit intelligent design and artistic discrimination of the highest order; and as they are neither useful nor ornamental to the birds thus adorned—since they cannot distinguish them, and since they could not have come by chance, any more than could the miniature painting of a landscape or the figures of the multiplication table—it follows that such exhibitions of ingenuity and artistic taste owe their conception and origin to an intelligent creative power above the known laws of Nature. This is particularly shown in the microscopic shells of ocean, where Mr. Darwin admits that sexual selection cannot come into play, and where these tints and patterns are of no use to the mollusks. What is marvelous and most confounding to the atheist is the fact that the finest tinted shells come from the darkest caverns of ocean-depths, where no light penetrates, and where none but the all-seeing eye could have penetrated to execute such designs in colors and geometrical lines. And in viewing these shells, dredged from rayless depths, the higher the power of the microscope applied, the more artistic the tints and the more symmetrical and ingenious the patterns become! What mind but that of an infinite intelligence could have conceived, and then designed, and then drawn, these wonderful patterns and shadings, and then ordained the laws and forces by which they could be thus reproduced from generation to generation in the darkest caves of the ocean? To deny the existence of God who can see all objects from the least to the greatest in the vast realms of the universe, is to relegate these ingenious and artistic productions of Nature to no cause but that of blind chance, which is simply an infinite absurdity, by the side of which the existence of God becomes a simple proposition.

Since evolution, in its wildest range of conjecture, either according to Darwin or Haeckel, does not even pretend to account for these intelligent adaptations of skill and art to the beautiful in Nature, as viewed by the highest intelligences on earth, it is compelled to acknowledge an intelligent origin for such otherwise inexplicable mysteries. The argument of *design*, then, if logically viewed, alone demonstrates the existence of an intelligence above Nature, as the first cause and rational solution of the countless wonders all around us, and no explanation of such intelligent power so completely satisfies the mind as to make it identical with the God of the Bible—"Who spake and it was done; who commanded and it stood fast."

## INDEX TO CHAPTERS.


PAGE.

I. Forty-Four Principal Proof-Texts supposed to Favor Universalism, Critically Examined and Analyzed ..... 9

II. The Coming of the Lord ..... 91

III. The General Judgment ..... 115

IV. Twenty-Five Distinct Arguments in Proof of the Conditionality of Eternal Life in the Future State ..... 154

V. Personality of the Devil ..... 166

VI. The Forgiveness of Sins ..... 173

VII. Compunctions of Conscience ..... 186

VIII. Testimony of 100 Witnesses ..... 198

IX. Debate on the Attributes and Perfections of the Deity between Alpha and Omega ..... 209

X. A Brief Review of the Rev. George Rogers' *Pro and Con of Universalism* ..... 280

XI. The Immortality of the Soul Philosophically Demonstrated ..... 309

XII. Does Death End All? Numbers One, Two, and Three ..... 324

# THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN LIFE

(BY THE AUTHOR OF UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF,)

Is a large Royal Octavo Volume of 524 double-column pages, containing three times the matter of this book, discussing exhaustively the questions of Materialism and Evolution in all their forms, and examining elaborately the writings of the three distinguished evolutionists,—Darwin, Huxley, and Haeckel. It also attacks the received theory of sound, as the representative "mode of motion" of physical science, in which the writings of the three leading physicists,—Tyndall, Helmholtz, and Mayer,—are critically reviewed. The work contains, as a frontispiece, the portraits of the six scientists named above, and sells at $2, cloth, and $2.50, leather. Mailed on receipt of price.

---

# WILFORD'S MICROCOSM

(A WILFORD HALL, EDITOR,)

Is a monthly magazine of 32 Super-Royal Octavo double-column pages, devoted to the discussion of all questions of science and philosophy in their bearings upon the religious thought of the age. This magazine has achieved a success from the very start of its publication unparalleled in the annals of journalism, having reached the first year nearly 20,000 subscribers, and numbering among its patrons more than 6,000 clergymen of the various denominations. It is now permanently established. Subscription price, $1 per volume of 12 numbers each, subscribers to take the magazine from the commencement of the volume at the time of subscribing. Each volume forms a complete book in itself for binding and preservation, and will not bear separation. The magazine will be given one year free as a premium to the purchaser of a copy of the *Problem of Human Life* at retail as above. Or any person sending us four subscriptions for *The Microcosm* with the money ($4), will receive the "Problem" in cloth by mail free. The same in leather, for five subscriptions. For three subscriptions ($3) the magazine will be sent during one volume, or a copy of *Universalism Against Itself*, or a copy of the Rev. Dr. Olmsted's *Walks and Words of Jesus*, free. For a description of this last named most valuable book (price $1), see cover of *Microcosm*.

HALL & CO., Publishers.

23 PARK ROW, NEW YORK.

BX9947.H34 1883
Universalism against itself :
Andover-Harvard 000753476
3 2044 077 882 348